

UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW
OR
CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR
JANUARY, 1911 APRIL, 1911.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CCXIII.

118547
21/9/11

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA.
LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY, NEW YORK.

1911.

CONTENTS OF No. 435.

	Page
ART. I. — A History of English Prosody from the Twelfth Century to the Present Day. By George Saintsbury, Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in the University of Edinburgh. Three vols. London: Macmillan and Co. 1906-10 . . .	1
II.—1. Republican Text Book for the Congressional Campaign, 1910. Issued by the Republican Congressional Committee. 1133 Broadway, New York.	
2. Democratic Campaign Book for 1910. Published by the National Democratic Congressional Committee, Washington, D.C. . . .	32
III.—1. Board of Education. Reports from those Universities and University Colleges in Great Britain which participated in the Parliamentary Grant for University Colleges in the year 1908-9. [Cd. 5246.] 1910.	
2. Royal Commission on University Education in London. Appendix to First Report of the Commissioners. Minutes of Evidence, July 1909—April 1910. With Appendices and Index. [Cd. 5166.] 1910	57
IV.—1. The Laws of Heredity. By G. Archdall Reid. London: Methuen. 1910.	
2. Mendel's Principles of Heredity. By W. Bateson. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1909.	
3. Phases of Evolution and Heredity. By David Berry Hart. London: Rebman. 1910 . . .	77
V.—1. Ancient and Modern Imperialism. By the Earl of Cromer. London: John Murray. 1910.	
2. Trois Ans en Perse. Par le Comte de Gobineau. Paris. 1858.	106
[And other Works.]	
VI.—1. Cost of Living of the Working Classes. Report of an Enquiry by the Board of Trade into Working Class Rents, Housing and Retail Prices, together with the standard rates of wages prevailing in certain occupations in the principal industrial towns of the United Kingdom. 1908. [Cd. 3864.]	
2. Cost of Living, etc. etc., in the principal industrial towns of the German Empire. 1908. [Cd. 4032.]	131
[And other Works.]	

ART. VII.—1.	The Oxford Book of Ballads. Chosen and edited by Arthur Quiller-Couch. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910.	
2.	Ballads and Metrical Tales. By R. Southey. London: 1838.	
3.	The Defence of Guenevere and other Poems. 1st ed., 1858. Vol. I. of the Collected Works of William Morris. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1910.	
4.	Ballads and Songs (1894), New Ballads (1897), The Last Ballad (1899). By John Davidson. London: John Lane	153
	[And other Works.]	
VIII. —	The 'Right to Work'	180
IX.—1.	Marie Stuart. By Lady Blennerhassett. Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1909.	
2.	Histoire du Règne de Marie Stuart. By Martin Philippson. Paris: Emile Bouillon. 3 vols. 1891.	
3.	Maria Stuart im Drama der Weltliteratur. Leipzig: Max Hesse's Verlag. 1907.	
4.	Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots, 1561–7. By T. K. Pollen, S.J. Scottish Historical Society. 1901.	
5.	The Casket Letters and Mary Queen of Scots. By T. F. Henderson. London: A. and C. Black. 1890.	
6.	The Mystery of Mary Stuart. By Andrew Lang. London: Longmans and Co. 1902.	
7.	Authentic Portraits of Mary Queen of Scots. By Lionel Cust. London: John Murray. 1903	200
X.—1.	The History of England from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of Henry VIII (1485–1547). By H. A. L. Fisher, M.A. (Political History of England, Vol. V.) London: Longmans. 1906.	
2.	The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth (1547–1603). By A. F. Pollard, M.A. (Political History of England, Vol. VI.) London: Longmans. 1910.	
3.	Henry VIII. By A. F. Pollard, M.A. 2nd Edition. London: Longmans. 1905	229
XI.—1.	Speech of the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour, M.P., at Nottingham. November 17, 1910.	
2.	Speech of the Prime Minister at Hull. November 25, 1910.	
3.	Speech of the Marquis of Lansdowne at Glasgow. November 25, 1910.	
4.	Speech of the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour, M.P., at the Albert Hall. November 29, 1910	255

CONTENTS OF No. 436.

	Page
ART I. — Chatham—His Early Life and Connections. By Lord Rosebery. Arthur L. Humphreys. 1910.	277
II.—1. The Origin of a Land Flora. By F. O. Bower, Sc.D., F.R.S. London: Macmillan and Co. 1908.	
2. The Structure and Development of Mosses and Ferns (Archegoniatae). By Douglas Houghton Campbell, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1905.	
3. A History of Botany, 1860–1900. By J. Reynolds Green, Sc.D., F.R.S., F.L.S. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1909.	
4. Lectures on the Evolution of Plants. By Douglas Houghton Campbell, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1899.	
5. A Text-Book of Botany. By Dr. Edward Strasburger and others. Third English Edition revised by W. H. Lang, M.B., D.Sc. London: Macmillan and Co. 1908.	299
[And other Works.]	
III.—1. Official History (Naval and Military) of the Russo-Japanese War. Vol. I. (to August 24, 1904). Prepared by the Historical Section of the Committee of Imperial Defence. London: Harrison and Sons. 1910.	
2. The Russo-Japanese War. Prepared in the Historical Section of the German General Staff. Authorised translation by Karl von Donat. London: Hugh Rees.	
3. La Guerre Russo-Japonaise. Prepared in the Historical Section of the French General Staff and published in the 'Revue Militaire des Armées Étrangères.' No. 956. Juillet 1907 et seq.	
4. The Russian Army and the Japanese War. By Gen. Kuropatkin. London: John Murray. 1909.	
5. Field Service Regulations: Part I. Operations. By the General Staff. London: Harrison and Sons. 1909.	321
[And other Works.]	
IV:—1. The Pursuit of Reason. By C. F. Keary, M.A. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1910.	
2. On a General Tendency of Thought during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century. By Dr. J. Theodore Merz. Andrew Reid and Co. 1910.	
3. Philosophical Essays. By Bertram Russell, M.A., F.R.S. Longmans, Green and Co. . . .	347

ART. V.—1.	Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England) and Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Hertfordshire. Anno Dom. MCMX.	
2.	The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions of Scotland, etc.	370
	[And other Works.]	
VI.—1.	Descriptive Sociology. Classified and arranged by Herbert Spencer. No. IX. Chinese. By E. T. C. Werner, Edited by Henry R. Tedder. London: Williams and Norgate. 1910.	
2.	Descriptive Sociology. Classified and arranged by Herbert Spencer. No. X. Greeks: Hellenic Era. By J. P. Mahaffy and W. A. Goligher. Edited by Henry R. Tedder. London: Williams and Norgate. 1910.	392
VII.—	The Conflict of Colour. By B. L. Putnam Weale. London: Macmillan and Co. 1910.	419
VIII.—1.	Sea-Wolves of the Mediterranean: the Grand Period of the Moslem Corsairs. By Commander E. Hamilton Currey, R.N. London: John Murray. 1910.	
2.	Charles Philip Yorke, Fourth Earl of Hardwicke, Vice-Admiral R.N. A Memoir. By Lady Biddulph of Ledbury. London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1910.	443
IX.—1.	A Roman Frontier Post and its People: the Fort of Newstead in the Parish of Melrose. By James Curle. Glasgow: Maclehose. 1911.	
2.	The Roman Wall in Scotland. By George Macdonald. Glasgow: Maclehose. 1911.	
3.	Corstopitum, Reports of the Excavations 1907-9. Newcastle-on-Tyne.	
4.	Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 1899-1906. Edinburgh.	
5.	The Roman Forts on the Bar Hill. By George Macdonald and Alexander Park. Glasgow: Maclehose. 1906.	468
X.—	La Duchesse du Maine, Reine de Sceaux et Conspiratrice (1676-1753). Par Le Général de Piépape. Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1910. .	491
XI.—	The Life of George Joachim Goschen, First Viscount Goschen, 1831-1907. By the Hon. A. D. Elliot. London: Longmans. 1911. . .	523

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
JANUARY, 1911.*

No. CCCCXXXV.

ART. I.—ENGLISH PROSODY.

A History of English Prosody from the Twelfth Century to the Present Day. By GEORGE SAINTSBURY, Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in the University of Edinburgh. Three vols. London: Macmillan and Co. 1906–10.

AT the outset of his work on English Prosody, Professor Saintsbury tells us of the hesitations which he had in choosing a title. Should he call his book a history of English metre or of English versification? The title 'A History of English Rhythm' has been preoccupied by Guest's well-known volumes. As a rule, such questions of nomenclature are of secondary importance. In the present case they suggest an initial difficulty which needs to be cleared away. 'History of Rhythm,' 'History of Metre,' 'History of Versification,' 'History of Prosody': all these have in them the seeds of misunderstanding. They imply, or they seem to, a certain independent existence in the things specified, rhythms, metres, and so forth, from the poetry which they contain—as distinct as the wine-jar is from the wine. But the relation of these two, poetry and the forms of poetry, is organic not mechanical; and it is the distinctive merit of Professor Saintsbury's book that he rises to the truer view in this matter: though we are not sure that even he reaches the full height of the 'argument.'

Guest's 'History of English Rhythms,' which is the only treatise we can bring into comparison with Professor

* All rights reserved.

Saintsbury's,* is rendered in the sum almost worthless by Guest's absurd attempt to treat Early English or Anglo-Saxon versification as one and the same with true English verse. Nobody, who listened unbiased to the counsels of his own ear, could fail to see the difference between the recitative character of Anglo-Saxon poetry and the true rhythmic character of English verse. 'The differences of [between] English verse of 1000 and English verse of 1300 are differences of nature and kind; the differences of English verse in 1300 and 1900 are mere differences of practice and accomplishment.'† Nothing material would, we think, have been lost had the author of this history of prosody after once indicating divergence from Guest, left the matter there: nor insisted so frequently on his own method of scansion by feet, and of equivalence and so forth, as if they were something utterly new and of themselves of vast importance to the understanding of poetry; whereas they are in part a logomachy only. There is no theoretic obligation for applying terms taken from Greek and Latin prosody to English verse: feet in the true, the classic sense we have not got and cannot have, when our vowel sounds have no fixed value in verse. And that a poet with such a delicate ear as Coleridge should have been contented with a nomenclature different from that of our author is evidence, not so much of a mental defect or of obstinacy in error on the part of Coleridge, as of the truth that there is no expressing in words the niceties of sound, which the trained ear can detect. 'Bubbling,' for example, is neither a complete spondee 'bubb-ling' nor a complete dactyl 'bubble-ing,' but something between the two. Again, if we are to use Greek names for feet we ought in strictness to apply them more or less in the classic manner to the words as they are usually pronounced in prose. Thus 'land-owner' is clearly (in prose) a bacchius (- - ^u); and such, too, is 'Almighty'; but such a foot as (- - ^u) is impossible in English verse; wherefore in verse, at any rate, in exact scansion 'land-owner' or 'Almighty' would have to become a cretic (^u - ^u) or a dactyl. Let us see, however, how these words are dealt with in our English prosody. Whoso repeats as they should be repeated Milton's lines,

* Mr. Omond's interesting 'Study of Metre' (1907) cannot be reckoned among histories, any more than can similar treatises by Ruskin and by Lanier of Boston ('The Science of English Verse'), both written some thirty years ago.

† Saintsbury, vol. i. p. 79.

'These are thy glorious works, Parent of good,
Almighty! Thine this universal frame
Thus wondrous fair,'

will make so much of a pause on the first two syllables of 'Almighty' that the word becomes in effect a bacchius, just what we have said is not admissible in English verse; while on the other hand, whoso attempts to *scan* the simple line,

'Almighty thine this universal frame,'

cannot make it other than the normal form of blank verse which is commonly called an iambic pentameter: * so that the line becomes

'Ólmíghtȳ thine thĭs ūnĭvĕrsāl frāme.'

This is a case like that of 'bubbling,' where the fine ear has to make distinctions which to prosody are unknown. One should perhaps rather say with Mr. Omond that 'time' as well as 'scansion' is an essential element in English prosody. But it has not a place in Professor Saintsbury's scheme.

With the reserve which the above remarks imply, we may accept frankly Professor Saintsbury's nomenclature and agree with him to talk of the English line being divided into feet, and leave the word 'accent' for other connexions. 'Feet with equivalence' is Professor Saintsbury's root-principle for English verse: equivalence being the substitution now and again of two short syllables for a long. Thus in the couplet,

'Lo, where Maeotis sleeps, and hardly flows
The freezing Tanais through a waste of snows,'

'Tanais' is an equivalent, the two shorts Tānā being substituted for a long as the 'o' in 'Maeotis' of the foregoing line. (Here we notice once again that in scansion 'Maeotis,' properly a bacchius, has to become a cretic.) The effect of equivalence is nearly always pleasing when used in moderation. And though such substitutions were opposed to Pope's principles in prosody, they were (as our author notes) agreeable to his ear. For the above couplet was Pope's favourite out of all his verse. 'The reason of this preference I cannot discover' says Johnson. 'We can,' rightly comments Professor Saintsbury.

The two verses cited above illustrate another principle or feature in versification on which Professor Saintsbury has

* It is one of Professor Saintsbury's pedantries that he will not admit this the common description of the English heroic line.

much to say. This is what he calls 'enjambment,' or the striding over of the sense or phrase from one line to the next. In the present case the change in scansion from *ōtis* to *Tānāis* is prepared for by the running on of the sense, 'hardly flows the 'freezing Tanais.' As a general rule Pope's couplet becomes soon wearying to the ear (the 'Popean couplet' in its wider sense yet more so), precisely on account of the rarity of this 'enjambment,' which is mostly made difficult or impossible; while the sense of monotony is increased by the antithesis. Antithesis is almost as obligatory in this type of verse as another sort of antithesis (or parallelism) is in Hebrew poetry. In Chaucer's heroic metre (in *form* the same as Pope's) monotony is saved partly by a less regular caesura * than we find in Pope and his imitators, partly by enjambment, which, though not common, there is nothing in Chaucer to forbid.† The best place, however, in which to study enjambment is in our blank verse, and we shall return to the subject of it there.

In one respect only does Guest's habit of speaking of 'accent' rather than of quantity—essentially misleading though it is—give him an advantage over Professor Saintsbury. It leaves Guest free to discuss what *he* calls quantity, viz. the different values of vowel-sounds in themselves, and the part which these sonorities individually play in verse, now serving to express slow, now rapid motion; now reproducing the soft flow of water, now the ruggedness of rocky land. There is great danger in these speculations: a poet himself may blunder heavily therein: as did Pope now and again in his 'Essay on 'Criticism.' But these things have a place—along with subtler elements still—in any theory of versification and study of the true technique of poetry. It is a great merit in Professor Saintsbury that he continually speaks outside his brief. He

* In his second volume (p. 453) by doubling back some score lines from the 'Rape of the Lock' Professor Saintsbury gives an amusing example of the monotony of the Popean caesura and of the regularity of antithesis in this verse.

† In the first hundred lines of the 'Knight's Tale' there are three examples of it:

'Wher that ther kneled in his weye

A companye of ladies' (lines 39, 40)

(which is perhaps only semi-enjambment—'in his way' being parenthetical).

'Have ye so great envye

Of mine honour that thus complayn and crye' (lines 49, 50).

'And sayde, "Lord, to whom Fortune has given
Victorie, and as a conqueror to liven "' (lines 57, 58).

is constantly bringing to our notice a variety of incidental delicacies in versification, which are indefinable and certainly not within the four walls of his professed subject. So that if Professor Courthope had not, with his 'History of English Poetry' preceded our author, this work on Prosody would almost be that, would at any rate be a very fair substitute for a history of English poetry. But Mr. Courthope's book exists, and we noticed it in a recent number of this Review. Mr. Courthope's work is the larger, by six volumes against three, and as a history of poetry as a whole it is necessarily the more complete. But, as at the time we pointed out, it often wanders wide from the subject in hand, and there is in its author's literary judgements much that is conventional, a certain affection for the *lieu commun* (not to call it too bluntly 'the commonplace'), a certain lack of vitality: to all these things Professor Saintsbury's volumes form a corrective. Thus does one work supplement the other. In one respect, however, the author we are reviewing is at a marked disadvantage. Mr. Courthope's writing is not always very inspiring; but it is dignified, and it can on occasion rise to the level of a fine style. Of Professor Saintsbury's prose it is a kindness to say the least possible. It must remain a wonder how one who for years has kept company with the best writers, who possesses (evidently) a nice and discriminating ear, can contrive to exclude all trace of style from his prose. But our author's faults on this head are inveterate, and criticism is vain which leads not to amendment.

In plan and construction some ways suggest themselves whereby Professor Saintsbury's book might have been bettered. Here it might have been ampler, here more restricted. It would have been a difficult task, yet not beyond the reach of industry, to follow out the really traceable influences which went to the formation of our *English* prosody. Our author sums these up indeed, but does not deal with the matter in an historical or evolutionary way. Two formative powers alone need be taken account of in the change of our verse from the patter of the Anglo-Saxon to the rhythm of the English: (1) the Latin hymn as sung in our churches, enforced by accompanying music (that too is in some degree recoverable); and (2) French verse, which from the twelfth to the fourteenth century went through a very rapid evolution and blossomed out into a great variety of forms. That all our 'rhythmic' poets were familiar with French is well-nigh certain—even the author of 'Piers Plowman' must have been so. It is significant, as Professor Saintsbury notes, that in Wright's 'Specimens of

'Lyric Poetry' * (of the thirteenth or early fourteenth century) the authors evidently wrote, the audience listened to, indifferently, French or English. Of later writers, Chaucer of course knew French thoroughly, and Gower wrote in both languages. French poetry—all modern European poetry—may in the ultimate analysis be found derivable from the Latin hymn. The direct influence on us which came from each of the two sources we have named is probably distinguishable. To attempt the distinction would ask a more lengthy analysis than could possibly be undertaken in an article. The French influence is the only one which is easily traceable. Before it brought to bear its attractive force on ours, French literature had already gone through a course of developement. The long *laisse* of assonantal rhymes which characterises the 'Chansons de Geste' of the eleventh and twelfth centuries had been succeeded by the romantic *lai*, whose normal form was the octosyllabic couplet. Both these types of verse may be described as epic—though 'narrative' were really the better word. But side by side with these flourished the true lyric forms, the dance or ballad verses. The interesting 'Les Sermons du Heron' of Wright's 'Political Poems' † is in *laissez* of the 'Geste' form. And that belongs to the opening of the Hundred Years' War—to Edward III's first invasion of France (*c.* 1340). Since M. Bodier's writings on the 'Chansons de Geste' it is impossible with assurance to accept these as so early or so 'epic' in character as they were once thought to be.‡ Precisely when the lyric forms were invented we cannot say. They soon found their way to England. The beautiful 'ballade'-stanza, which we naturally associate with the name of Francois Villon, is found in English verse at the very beginning of the fifteenth century, thirty

* 'Specimens of Lyric Poetry composed in England in the Reign of Edward I.' By Thomas Wright (Percy Soc.), 1842.

† Rolls Series, No. 14.

‡ In his 'Antiquitates Italicae Medii Aevi' (vol. iii.) Muratori publishes a beautiful Latin poem belonging to the first quarter of the tenth century, of which the following are the opening lines :

'O tu qui servas armis ista moenia,
Noli dormire, monco, sed vigila;
Dum Hector vigil exstitit in Troia,
Non eam cepit fraudulenta Graecia';

and so on for eighteen successive a- endings (long and short indifferently) which can hardly be described as rhymes, but which are natural forerunners to the assonantal *laisse* of the vernacular 'Chansons de Geste.'

years before Villon was born. Twenty-six political poems edited in 1904 by Dr. J. Kail for the Early English Text Society (from the Digby MS. in the Bodleian) are all in this metre. Here is a specimen of one. It is somewhat irregular, after the manner of political pieces such as these, which were written for edification not for art :

‘ Man synne not in overhope
 Thou wynnest not Goddis mercie with fight
 Hit wolde bringe the in wanhope [despair]
 To wene no mercy thou heven myght
 Allething is nombred in Goddis sight,
 The leste [least] tryp that ever ye trede [tread].
 His mercy is medled [mingled] with his right.
 Man, knowe thyself, love God, and drede [dread].

The last line is the refrain through a score of verses. And among the just mentioned Political Poems published by Wright, ‘ The Complaint of the Plowman ’* (c. 1393) and the ‘ Lament of ‘ the Duchess of Gloucester ’ (c. 1441) are in the same metre.

If we dwell at some length upon these beginnings of metric poetry in English it is because the question of ‘ origins ’ has here a special importance. Professor Saintsbury appreciates that importance, and there is throughout his work no volume and no part of a volume so interesting to the student of versification as his first, and the pages of it which he devotes to describing the naturalisation of the French forms among us and their conversion into *national* poetry ; though (as we have said) even here something might have been added, and would have been added perhaps if our author had concerned himself with ‘ versification ’ in its widest sense. All ballad forms came, if originally from Italy, to us and to the whole of Northern Europe through France. The verbs *baller* (Fr.) and *ballare* (Ital.), ‘ to dance,’ are evidence enough of this. The forms spread to Germany, to England, to Scotland, to the Scandinavian countries, to far Iceland, where the word *danz* meant rather a song than a dance. In England, in Scotland, in the Scandinavian lands, the French form of the ballad was preserved more purely than in Germany. The *ballade* which we spoke of just now, what may fairly be called the ‘ Villon-ballade ’ (as we name rhyme-royal after James I of Scotland, though it was used by Chaucer long before his day) is only a specialised type of the ‘ ballad,’ whose *generic* form is marked by the refrain or chorus—the natural accompaniment to the dance—marked perhaps also

* Only the first and second parts of this poem have the ballade refrain. The title of course is taken from Langland.

by some special action in the dance, like the clapping of hands in modern Spanish dancing. But the ballad should never be thought of as in its origin an epic or narrative poem (such as street ballads became); it only turned into that (probably) because it had absorbed into itself something from the abandoned *lai* or *romance*. By a curious custom of the Middle Ages, these amusements, dancing and the singing of 'rounds' or ballads, frequently took place in churchyards. This brought them into continual contact with and opposition to the Puritan element in Catholicism—and the essential element in medieval Catholicism was Puritan—an opposition which is for us crystallised in the medieval legend of the dancers who, keeping up their dance all Christmas Eve till mass-time on Christmas morning, were so found by the priest, and even then refused to go to church till their 'round' was ended. For which contumacy they were cursed by the priest and had to dance on for a twelve-month without stopping. Nearest neighbours are the keenest rivals. And this neighbourhood of the ballad to the Church service was probably not (as in the story) a physical one only. It is a reasonable conjecture that the refrain of the ballad was first suggested by the liturgical 'refrains' chanted inside the church. This popular music then was at once nearest to and furthest from the Latin hymn: nearest because it owed to that its form; whereas the prototype of the 'Geste,' and from it of the 'Romance,' is to be found in such Latin poems as the one cited above from Muratori: furthest from the hymn because it expressed most sharply the protest which the 'gaiety of nations' made against the Puritan severity of religion in those days. This protest spread upwards. Thus the 'Romance' is a less severe, less heroic type of verse than the 'Geste': and if we accept the theories of M. Bédier that will not alter the position of things. For though, according to these theories, we cannot well make a time-distinction between the 'Romances' and the 'Gestes,' there still remains with the latter a certain clerical influence and also a certain heroic intention, which the romances lacked. Whoso holds as we do to the organic relationship of versification and poetry, of the *forme* and the *fond*, will see already the importance of the above considerations. And presently their importance will be further emphasised.

If for a moment we let our thoughts wander back to that lost poetry, the bygone alliterative verse of the Teutonic-Gothic race in its greatest splendour, and let them drop again (for in some ways it is a fall) to the smooth, melodious beauties of our English verse in the Chaucer age, we feel that something has gone which can never be recovered. We cease to wonder so

much either at the obstinacy of Guest, who would try to link together these diverse products, or at the lingering taste for the old metre which made 'The Vision of Piers the Plowman' (which really is not fine poetry) a popular poem down to Elizabethan days : so that to-day the extant MSS. of it are only fewer than those of the 'Canterbury Tales.' It is perhaps no use crying over spilt milk. Our gain in the new poetry is also vast. Not rapidly but very traceably we see—through the examples which Professor Saintsbury gives and through the not inconsiderable body of poetry from which he can only give extracts, all that verse preserved in the publications of the Percy Society, the Early English Text Society, and elsewhere—we see the English ear and taste refining itself until with Chaucer it bursts upon us in sudden perfection. As regards technique Gower is not so far behind. But Chaucer has the qualities of all but the very greatest of our poets, so that with him we seem to have quite entered into our inheritance. Nothing could bring home to us how truly this is so, how little in essentials there is of difference between Chaucer and the Tudor poets, than a perusal of the well-known song of Troilus in 'Troilus and Criseyde.' Let us take the first verse only :

' If no love is, O God, what fele I so ?
 And if love is, what thing and wiche is he !
 If love be good, from whennes comth my wo ?
 If it be wikke,* a wonder thinketh me
 When every torment and adversitee
 That cometh† of him, may to me savory thinke ;
 For ay thurst I, the more that I it drinke,‡

wherein we see that in sentiment there lies nothing material between this and the Elizabethan lyric, and (allowing for differences in spelling and pronunciation) in prosody we have not much to advance. By the date of Chaucer, then, the essentials of English prosody have been attained. But the reason why Chaucer in this wise anticipates, not, indeed, the whole gamut of Elizabethan verse, not even the finest lyric verse, but what we may call the 'common form' of the lyrical and narrative verse of the later age, is that his inspiration and his sentiments are essentially those of the Elizabethans. In a book recently published, Mr. Sidney Lee has shown more clearly than was

* Wicked.

† *Sic* in ed. Skeat. But the line demands 'comth' as line 3.

‡ Troilus and Criseyde, Book I., lines 400. (Chaucer, ed. Skeat, vol. i.)

before surmised, the great debt of the Elizabethans to French poetry.* Of course there was also a debt to the Italians. The more accomplished of our Elizabethan or Tudor poets, such men as Surrey and Wyatt and Spenser, read Italian with ease. The debts of Spenser to Tasso are obvious. The majority of our poets did not read Italian, but they read French; and the Petrarchan sonnet and *canzone* floated down to them through the French poets. In prosody there are countless instances of inspiration drawn by us from beyond the Channel. The *ballade*, we saw, made its way here, but it was never naturalised: even the octosyllabic couplets of the lays and romances were never quite at home. They lived on, but they lived in degeneration chiefly, in doggerel. The rhyme-royal on the other hand, French in origin, became quite our own; and the rhyme-royal is father to the Spenserian stanza. These are two of the most honoured of our forms of narrative verse.

The rhyming couplet had a different fate. In France the octosyllable (contracted from the decasyllable of the earlier 'Gestes') was lengthened again into the Alexandrine; that was the form which had most vitality over there. With us the decasyllabic couplet became stereotyped—the most important of our metres—Chaucer's chief metre; till, it in its turn, by favour of the gods and the assistance of Surrey and of Marlowe and of Shakespeare, became our blank verse; the most *national* of all our verse forms, and the vehicle for what is greatest in our poetry.

This we take to be the second great epoch in the history of English versification; the substitution of French rhythm for Anglo-Saxon alliteration being the first. The second step is in a sense a reversal of the first. This is the moment of our final escape from French influence—it is the *act* of escape one may say. Mr. Lee has shown that much reminiscence of Ronsard and the Pleiad is found scattered about Shakespeare's lines. That kind of plagiarism is, however, of secondary importance. In the earlier verse the indebtedness of English prosody to French prosody is only the index of a much deeper

* 'The French Renaissance in England' by Sidney Lee (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910). Mr. Lee is not altogether convincing, for he is not very judicial. All items of evidence, good and bad, are assembled in his pages, as in the pleadings of a not too skilful advocate. Yet, all deductions made, enough remains to show that the influence of French literature on English in the sixteenth century was only one degree less marked than a like thing in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

indebtedness during the later Middle Ages, which we have just said operated by no means wholly to our advantage. France was in those days far ahead of us in the arts of life, among the latter, not least in those arts which the Greeks specially distinguished by their word *μουσική*—all that belonged to fineness of ear, alertness of movement, a sense of rhythm in speech or dance. The French ballads, we saw, gave the form to the ballads of all Europe. Every art finds its fixed place, its proper sphere of influence. On the side of solemnity and grandeur medieval Europe had all that it needed, more than it could well assimilate, in its magnificent architecture and in its church music. Poetry was wanted for the gayer emotions. Thus it is that the ballad-singers of the legend cursed by the priest symbolised not ineptly the poetry of that age face to face with what Carlyle called ‘the eternities and the immensities.’ Such greater emotions therefore are mostly wanting from our earlier poetry. And a certain frivolity, a certain insincerity *does* accompany the lyric charm of that verse. It is shown in the passage we quoted from ‘Troilus and Criseyde.’ Nothing could demonstrate it more clearly than the fact (noted just now) that, barring a few small details, this lover’s complaint might have been written equally well in the sixteenth century. Troilus’ complaint is like that of any lover in the sixteenth century, and the versification of ‘Troilus and Criseyde’ is in essence similar to the versification of ‘The Faerie Queene’; because both unknowingly re-echoed the far-off tradition of the *chanson courtoise* of medieval chivalry. Therefore these rhymed poems were destined to give way to blank verse, because, though love was still to be, as it should be, a large part of life, it, along with light-heartedness, gaiety, and wit, made up not the whole of life, as they were almost the whole of French-English poetry in the Middle Ages or later Middle Ages. In the vast achievement of Elizabethan blank-verse drama, love of the tenderer kind—lyrical love—has a secondary place. Marlowe cared little for it. Shakespeare with one exception reserved it for his comedies; and in his comedies Shakespeare is often frankly conventional and, so far, insincere. One cannot say that love and tenderness are the moving forces or inspire the best lines in ‘The Duchess of Malfi’ and ‘The White Devil.’ There is more of it in Beaumont and Fletcher, in the latter especially. Perhaps, outside Shakespeare, ‘The Faithful Shepherdess’ and Heywood’s ‘A Woman Killed by Kindness’ are the tenderest and most affecting dramas of the Elizabethan cycle. Compared with the great tragedies, plays of this order are few. All this is

germane to the history of prosody and the history of versification for whoever holds that the matter, the inspiration, makes the style. You may express it as you choose, either that the discovery of this new medium allowed men once more to embrace in poetry the whole gamut of human interest and emotion, or that the *sense*, the growing feeling that poetry belonged to all life and all life to poetry, created this new medium to fill the gap. If we take the latter, probably the juster view, then we shall reckon not insignificant the separation from national thought of those other more religious expressions of 'the eternities and immensities' which medieval Catholicism had provided. It has been accounted strange that just as, or just after, Edward VI had destroyed so many of the church bells and organs, and reformed the services of the Church almost to a Puritan fashion, the greatest era of secular music arose. But on the theory which we have laid down just now, it is not wonderful.

Spenser's verse, which Professor Saintsbury we think rates too high, represents the old tradition in its finest form: that is why it was so popular in its own age; it represented the far-off chivalrous poetry of the past; in an infinitely higher rank, it yet had kinship with the prose romance of the 'Amadis de Gaul' type. The blank-verse drama, on its side, with its reality (its realism one may say) and the width of its appeal, has (from a higher plane again) a clear kinship with 'Don Quixote,' that parent of all succeeding prose fiction. Because Spenser himself belonged in nature to the retrospective order, this poetry, in contrast with the newer verse of the dramas, cannot be studied so well in Spenser as in, say, Shakespeare's sonnets. These last seem to us to give a perfect picture of a mind of the highest type working in a medium which is really foreign to it, which it has not (if one may so express it) recreated for itself. Before we examine into the perfection of technique which blank verse gives us, it is well worth while to pause a moment over the Shakespearean sonnet. Of what kind was Shakespeare's inducement to write these poems? Wordsworth and many others have supposed that he did it to unlock his heart. But we cannot overlook the evidence which Mr. Sidney Lee brought forward long ago of the imitative character of Shakespeare's sonnets, evidence which Mr. Lee's more recent researches only confirm. Thus the sonnets of Shakespeare and his dramatic blank verse would stand for what we have taken them as, the one a clear echo of foreign versification, the other the highest attainment of pure English versification. This would not of course mean

that there was no foundation for the feelings to which Shakespeare gives expression in his sonnets; no young nobleman—Southampton or whoever it might be—for whom Shakespeare had a real *cultus*—no dark lady who inspired him with passion. But it would mean that for the sake of conforming to a prescribed type (the far-off echo of the *chanson courtoise* in fact) Shakespeare had exaggerated and in a degree denaturalised these feelings. And here the test of the technique of the versification itself comes in very aptly. The sonnets are full of beautiful lines, images, phrases; how, being Shakespeare's, could it be otherwise? But they are also very full of technical faults. These do not always lie quite strictly within the field of prosody, but they are very recognisable and distinguishable from the content of the poems. The sonnets' most flagrant fault lies in the bathoses into which their final couplets fall. No doubt the quatorzaine lays itself open to this blemish; and, if we were to agree with Professor Saintsbury that the quatorzaine is a more truly English poem than the Petrarchan sonnet, then we should have to say that the sonnet is not adapted as a medium for English poetry. But surely 'Avenge, 'O Lord' and 'The world is too much with us' would, if they stood alone, refute such a theory. It is difficult in the quatorzaine to avoid bathos. One of the very finest achievements in this medium (by a poet in other things scarcely more than second-rate) is Daniel's 'Care-charmer Sleep.' The last couplet of this,

'Still let me sleep embracing clouds in vain
And never wake to face the day's disdain,'

hardly keeps the level of the other twelve lines,* and so is literally a bathos; though in the case of lines of such beauty the word seems harsh. 'Bathos' is not too harsh a word for such final couplets of Shakespeare's as

'For sweetest things turn sourest by their deeds;
Lilies that fester smell far worse than weeds.'

'That I an accessory needs must be
To that sweet thief which sourly robs from me.'

where the weakness of the thought is very aptly echoed by the weakness of the verse and of the line-endings. The difficulty throughout Shakespeare's sonnets is rather to find one in which

* Its chief fault is redundancy in the two phrases 'Still let me sleep' and 'And never wake.'

the final couplet is not a marked bathos and in itself feeble.* The line-endings again of the final couplets ask special notice. Théodore de Banville has, in his '*Traité de Versification*,' laid it down as a rule for French verse that the rhyme must never fall on an insignificant word. He does not give very fully his reasons for this dictum; but it would be easy to justify it on logical grounds and to show that it applies to rhyme in any language and even as a general rule to all line-endings. Now turn to Shakespeare's sonnets and see how often in the final couplets this rule is violated. (It is violated pretty frequently in the body of the sonnets likewise.) The rhyme 'thee,' 'me,' for instance, occurs eight times† in the suite; 'be,' 'thee' four times; 'be,' 'me' twice. We have besides 'fee,' 'me,' 'free,' 'me,' 'ye,' 'me,' ('assure ye' and 'cure me'!); altogether more than ten per cent. of the sonnet-endings contain some rhyme of the kind we have indicated. Turning to a matter more strictly of prosody we have in nearly twenty per cent. of the sonnets a spondaic ending, such as 'lives sweet,' 'prove none,' 'love sheds,' 'will shows,' 'grow sad,' 'sweet skill,' 'that time,' 'fine wit,' 'gives scope,' 'same part,' 'your truth,' 'more rare,' 'your will,' 'still green,' 'shine bright,' 'bring forth,' 'seem woe,' 'mayst take,' 'did play,' &c. ‡

These are of course just the kind of harshnesses which we get in the Shakespearean couplet when it appears amid the Shakespearean blank verse. And it might be thought that some fatal paralysis came over the poet's pen when he sought to avail himself of this particular metre. Without doubt some *additional* badness of the sonnet-couplets is due to this disability in their author. But the bodies of the quatorzaines are full of errors of versification less glaring than those we have taken from the couplets, but of a similar kind.⁴ Here, too, feeble line-endings ('thee,' 'me,' 'are,' etc.) are by no means rare, and now and again such defective rhymes as 'astronomy' and 'quality,' 'fleet'st' and 'sweets,' 'doting,' 'nothing,' etc. The same rhymes frequently recur in different sonnets, and ('verse,'

* 'Tired with all these, from these would I be gone
Save that to die I leave my love alone,'

is certainly of the very finest verse. The 'lest the wise world' couplet is another great one. But after these two, which?

† With such false rhyming as 'love thee,' 'move me' in the 26th sonnet.

‡ Here is one:

'Let them say more that like of hearsay well,'

of which the harshness cannot easily be surpassed.

'rehearse' for example) not such everyday rhymes that their repetition can be excused. We have to compare all these faults with the matchless perfection of Shakespeare's blank verse to understand what clear evidence they afford that the poet was not highly inspired (and not, we may therefore suspect, very deeply moved) when he wrote the sonnets.

This difference, then, between the Shakespearean sonnet and the Shakespearean dramatic verse may very well symbolise for us the transition from an outworn tradition—which dates back as far as the fourteenth century or earlier still, a tradition eminently French in its origin and Franco-chivalrous in its sentiment—to the true inheritance in a world of realities in love, war, adventure, such as existed in Tudor England.

We therefore now turn to the blank verse of the dramatists—of Shakespeare, in whom it reaches its apogee. Professor Saintsbury has much that is illuminating to say on this theme. It is probable that, though this form of verse contains a number of prosodic 'points' and asks a good deal of careful study to bring its excellences to the light of day, such will not seem to be the case to the general reader, who has been wont to regard it rather as a simple matter. There is no better test of a fine ear for poetry than lies in the power to appreciate blank verse. But the blank verse of our great dramatists is a medium for so much beyond and outside itself, that it does not necessarily argue a defect of ear when we find it disconsidered. It is very easy and very natural to take it as it comes, as Jaques took his reflections, giving heaven thanks for its beauty and letting the matter rest there. The chief real advantage of prosodic and kindred studies is that they correct this tendency, and force us to pass the sweets of poetry slowly over the palate, giving us a zest which we never afterwards lose.

Let us begin by recalling the two main elements which Professor Saintsbury distinguishes as contributing to beautify the prosody of blank verse—or of all poetry for that matter. The first is 'equivalence' or substitution—when now and again two short syllables are substituted for a long—as in the 'Tanais' instance which we quoted. Done constantly this would either mar the verse or change its character; done now and again it adds greatly to its charm. The second element of added beauty is 'enjambment,' the passing over of the sentence from one line to another, and not merely, as we shall see, the simple sense-transition, but a certain continuance of the 'phrasing'; so that a complete phrase is formed which is different from the line itself. Professor Saintsbury speaks bluntly of the 'non-stop'

at the end of the line. That is too strong a word. Actors, by some absurd and false tradition, are given to uttering Shakespeare's verse with a complete non-stop, whenever the sense can be carried on; and by so doing they make the poetry sound like prose. It is not non-stop,* but a passing-on in the phrase; something like the counterpoint of music. The phrase has a beauty of its own, and a melody of its own; and within the phrase the line has still its own rhythm or melody. In order that its separate melody may be given to the phrase, it is necessary that the lines should also be divided unevenly—the pause must vary its place. This then is the third distinctly prosodical element to be looked for in the best blank verse—a variety of pause in the lines. Of course there are other (still technical) excellences to be noted—variety of vowel-sounds, for example, and (occasional) likeness of consonantal sounds—otherwise alliteration; for that is a very important element of beauty in all *Teutonic* verse. In a treatise on 'versification' these would need likewise to be considered. But they lie outside the realm of pure prosody, so we shall not expect Professor Saintsbury to treat of them.

Between Shakespeare and the pre-Shakespeareans the enjambment or non-stoppage of the line forms the main distinction. It is at this point that, in spite of their great beauty and power, Marlowe's lines nearly always fail.

'They are moulded individually not collectively. Even in those very great passages—the *locus classicus* on poetry in "Tamburlaine," the death agony of Faustus, the great speech of Bathsheba, and the rest—they are literally some dozen or sixteen lines (is it one of the "points in Hamlet's soul" that he meant this)† making it is true a whole of beauty, but separable into line-parts as Shakespeare's own greatest things are not. . . . So inherent and ingrained is this characteristic that it survives and neutralises the most audacious

* Professor Saintsbury objects on different grounds to the word end-stopped lines, as it might be taken to mean end-punctuated. 'And even if this is escaped, the mere stoppage of the line at the end is not the whole of the matter. It is true that a very large—an enormous—proportion of their (the earlier dramatists) lines have (or ought to have) stops at the end; but it is also true that many which have not even in modern editions, and perhaps ought not to have on any reasonable theory of punctuation, are yet end-lopped if not-stopped.' (Vol. ii. p. 6.)

† One has always to apologise for the author's style. Moreover the supposition that Hamlet could have 'meant this' is absurd, so that the awkward parenthesis is worse than needless.

enjambment in grammar, which does sometimes occur in these poets. As for instance in "The Jew of Malta,"

"Three hundred camels, and two hundred yoke
Of labouring oxen and five hund[e]red
She-asses,

where, do what you will, you cannot run the "five hundred she-asses" rhythmically together.

'There can be very little question that this peculiarity surviving and resisting even the immense *poetical* advance which these poets made is a great disadvantage. It is least felt in the Faustus speech, because that supreme agony consists with—almost invites—separated and ejaculatory expression. . . . But turn to the only less fine

"Leicester, if gentle words would comfort me,"

of "Edward the Second." It also is wonderful; but how one longs for one minute of Shakespeare to turn it from a string of dazzling beads to a winged serpent of colour and fire!

This last simile is exaggerated: there is not so much difference at *that* between Marlowe at his best and Shakespeare. At any rate the change from the end-stop to the phrase does not constitute such a change as that. But our author goes on justly enough:

'Almost every line has an actual stop at the end, and those which have not, for instance,

"And so it fares with me, whose dauntless mind
The ambitious Mortimer would seek to curb,"

are too stiffly and rigidly constructed towards the close to run on as they should.'

In the same play there are [Professor Saintsbury notes] two or three passages [from speeches of Edward II] where Marlowe 'almost shakes himself free' of the end-stop:

'Oh! Would I might! but heaven and earth conspire
To make me miserable

He of you all that most desires my blood,
And will be called the murderer of a king
Take it. . . .

And Isabel, whose eyes being turned to steel
Will sooner sparkle fire than shed a tear.'

In another speech of Isabel's own he comes even nearer :

'Our kindest friends in Belgia have we left
To cope with friends at home; a heavy case
When force to force is knit, and sword and glaive
In civil broils make kin and countrymen
Slaughter themselves in others and their side
With their own weapons gored! But what's the help?
Misgoverned kings are cause of all this wreck;
And, Edward, thou art one among them all,
Whose looseness hath betrayed thy land to spoil.
Who made the channel overflow with blood
Of thine own people.'*

It is worth while to pause a moment here on the threshold of the Shakespearean verse. We have not reached the highest. But how high we have got already! This is really better than the best of Spenser—in essentials; because, exquisite as Spenser is, there lies on his verse a certain frost of artificiality which has now quite vanished. It is as if a new day had dawned. This verse is better, too, in kind than anything in Chaucer. For though there is not in Chaucer the same sort of artificiality which Spenser has, his interests are restricted, he is essentially passionless: even in 'Troilus and Creseide' the passion is of that diluted sort which characterises the French romances as a whole; it is (to change the image) passion and tragedy labelled and exhibited under glass, not in their free growth in the open air. Not that even of Marlowe the above passage is the best that could be cited. Faustus' last speech, with its

'Stand still, ye ever moving spheres of heaven,
That time may cease and midnight never come;
Fair Nature's eye rise, rise again and make
Perpetual day; or let this hour be but
A year, a month, a week, a natural day;
That Faustus may repent and save his soul.

Yet, for Christ's sake whose blood hath ransomed me,
Impose some end to my incessant pain,'

if in some regards less accomplished than the lines from 'Edward II,' has a might and majesty which up till Marlowe's day had never been attained in English verse, had never been reached in drama since Sophocles wrote his last play. Turn for a moment from this and re-read even Spenser's 'Prothalamion' or almost any of Shakespeare's

* Cf. History of English Prosody, vol. ii. pp. 7-9.

sonnets, and we see the difference. In the first we are gliding on the Thames and have slipped back unconsciously into a world of gentle emotion and not wholly sincere romance :

‘ There in a meadow by the river’s side
A flocke of nymphs I chaunced to espy,
All lovely daughters of the flood thereby,
With goodly greenish locks all loose untide
As eche had been a bryde.’

But the verse has such a narcotic charm that, so soon as we have fallen under its spell, we straightway forget that there is anything greater. From Shakespeare’s sonnets we must except a few which have the passionate sincerity of his dramatic verse. One such is the sonnet

‘ O for my sake do you with Fortune chide.’

The most part have not this. And, what is to the point of our present enquiry, as they lose it they descend to a lower level of versification. Here is a verse from one of the finer sonnets :

‘ Is it thy will thy image should keep open
My heavy eyelids to the weary night ?
Dost thou desire my slumbers should be broken,
While shadows like to thee do mock my sight ? ’

where, however, the two ‘ shoulds,’ the ‘ dost thou desire,’ and ‘ do mock,’ nay the whole filling out of the last line of the quotation, proclaim lack of inspiration. In ‘ Venus and Adonis’ and in ‘ The Rape of Lucrece ’ the versification is on the average much inferior to this.

In entering the region of Shakespeare’s blank verse we are in a different world. Quite a different picture of wakefulness from the one just given is that of King Henry in the night-watches :

‘ O Sleep, O gentle Sleep,
Nature’s soft nurse, how have I frighted thee,
That thou no more will weigh mine eyelids down,
And steep my senses in forgetfulness ?

Can’st thou, O partial Sleep, give thy repose
To the wet sea-boy in an hour so rude ;
And in the calmest and most stillest night,
With all appliances and means to boot,
Deny it to a king ? ’

The line which begins ‘ And in the calmest ’ is somewhat faulty—it alone. But the two which precede it, the second

more especially, are among the most perfect which even Shakespeare ever wrote. Some of their distinguishing merits are not strictly prosodical. The 'wet sea-boy' line, for example, and the one beginning 'That thou no more' have a wave-like movement which comes partly from the use of thinner vowels in the middle of the lines, more weighty ones at the beginning and end. With the quasi-parenthetical interposition of the foregoing paragraphs we may now let Professor Saintsbury speak once more and unfold the prosodic excellences (perfections) of Shakespeare. Of 'Richard II' he writes :

'The prosodic, like the other interest of "Richard II," arising from comparison with Marlowe on the other hapless "Second,"* is exceptional, and it can hardly escape any reader who has got beyond the state of thinking prosody pedantry. . . . The single-line model is conspicuous throughout, and there are few finer instances of it than the famous "rally" of Gaunt and his exiled son :

"All places that the eye of heaven visits

O who can hold a fire in his hand"

to the King's final soliloquy just before his murder. But whereas in "Titus Andronicus" this model showed but few marks of approaching change by fusion, here those marks are ubiquitous. Even in some of the passages just referred to they appear. It is especially curious to notice how in the great patriotic speech of Gaunt, the central passage, though every line is self-closed as a line, the paragraph-effect is given in a way that Marlowe hardly ever attains, by the variation of the pause, the weighting of different parts of the line by the quicksilver power of specially sonorous or important words, and sometimes by a cunning parenthetical device which makes the voice hurry over parts of a line, or whole lines, so as to connect, rhythmically as in sense, what comes after with what comes before.†

Professor Saintsbury gives in a footnote the whole central passage from the speech of Gaunt. We have not space for that here. But the first five lines of the citation (e.g. in the fourth and fifth lines) already show us the beginning of that faculty which Shakespeare has of getting a second rhythm from his paragraphs beyond the rhythm of the lines—the harmonic as it might be called, of the verse-rhythm :

'This royal throne of kings, this sceptred isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise;
This fortress, built by Nature for herself
Against infection and the hand of war.'

* Edward II.

† Vol. ii. pp. 30-1.

And the means by which such effects as these are produced are very happily characterised by Professor Saintsbury. Most excellent is his phrase, 'the quicksilver power of specially 'sonorous or important words.' For it is precisely the rapid change of *weight* which quicksilver can bestow that marks Shakespeare's lines at their best.

In the whole speech of Gaunt the various processes described by our author may be studied. And the study would serve as a preliminary to an advance into the very centre of Shakespeare's workmanship. The beautiful

Time hath, my lord, a wallet at his back '

of 'Troilus and Cressida' is a further stage just short, Professor Saintsbury thinks, of perfect mastery. *That* we have in such lines as Cleopatra's

'Peace! Peace!

Dost thou not see my baby at my breast,
That sucks the nurse asleep?'

which Professor Saintsbury quotes. Or the—to our thinking—yet more beautiful,

'Poor naked wretches, wheresoe'er ye are,
That bide the pelting of this pitiless storm,
How shall your houseless heads and unfed sides,
Your looped and windowed raggedness, defend you
In seasons such as these?'

of Lear, where the fall of the cadence in the last half-line, contrasted with the raised tone of the questions, converts the whole paragraph into a harmony; and this in spite of the small enjambment in the passage. In truth the examples of such perfect work are countless. Then comes in the era of the redundant syllable, which Shakespeare took from younger men, much as—to compare less things with great—Manet's art came to be influenced by Monet's. This redundant syllable is associated in our minds with such a masterpiece as 'The Tempest' and thereby gains its own charm. Yet in itself it is decadent and the beginning of the disintegration of the blank-verse line, which was very rapid.

What followed in the next age was the heyday of the lyric. Not that the Caroline lyric was so good as the best of the Elizabethan. But there was much more of it that was good. Moreover it has shed the French influence—it is pure English, as is none but the very best of the previous age.

The prosodic history of the eighteenth century calls for not much comment. Though in a sense it is very important, it is far from interesting. We are familiar, and too familiar,

with the Aaron's rod of that prosodic history, the heroic couplet ; it became a rod to scourge all high poetic endeavour. The only sensible reliefs from it were the elegiac verse which attained its summit in the 'Elegy,' and which also characterises a good many short songs and pieces very often of an elegiac character ('Laments for Helen' and suchlike), which were conventional but with a kind of 'Dresden' or 'Sheraton' charm about them ; and the Pindaric ode. (Collins' supreme example of rhymeless alcaics must be left out of account as a 'sport.') The 'Pindaric' is not, indeed, of an age. But as Gray and Collins used it, it had a new birth direct from Pindar himself. This new birth was not on the whole a happy one. Born into an age which had little nourishment to give to the poet's mind, the Pindaric ode became, like the heroic couplet of that period, *on the whole* a thing of convention, full of gradus epithets and all the poetic diction which Wordsworth was to arraign. Now and again it springs into the empyrean—as with 'the Theban eagle' passage of Gray. But in the history of poetry of the highest kind the Pindaric ode is interesting chiefly as having prepared the way for Wordsworth's odes in the century following. The last we have no hesitation in considering the highest achievements in this special order of poetry which our language has produced. In all Professor Saintsbury's three volumes there is nothing, in our judgement, so unsatisfactory as his general neglect of Wordsworth, whom he cites most frequently in order to dispute his theories, which are of no consequence, not to praise nor much to study his practice, which is. Prosodically his neglect of Wordsworth as a writer of odes is most notable, because in that form the poet is unrivalled. As a sonneteer Wordsworth would be equally important, save on two counts. First, that he has been anticipated and (on occasion) outdone by Milton in this field ; secondly, that as the very word 'sonneteer' reminds us, the conversion of the sonnet to express deep moral convictions is something of or may be regarded as a sort of perversion, a straining at least of an accepted canon. Professor Saintsbury does so regard it. Not alone does he place the Shakespearean sonnet far higher than we have felt ourselves justified in doing ; but he places the Miltonic-Wordsworthian sonnet much lower than we believe any other critic—in love before all things with sincerity and the gifts it brings—has done or would dream of placing it. 'To Milton indeed,' he says in one place,* 'the sonnet is not 'much more than a form of verse-paragraph, and (*valeat*

* Vol. ii. p. 217.

'*quantum*') this peculiarity, in which he is followed by Wordsworth, seems to me to put him as a sonneteer not merely below 'Shakespeare but below Keats and Rossetti.' There is of course salvation in the *valeat quantum*; and we have not time to enlarge upon the theories and arguments which are meant to justify this stricture on the verse-paragraph. In these our author seems to us to come nearer to the old Lindley-Murray point of view (so frequent in earlier writers on prosody) than anywhere else in his three volumes.

To return to Wordsworth. The positive reason for Professor Saintsbury's misappreciation will appear later: that also we believe to be erroneous essentially; but in that it is a positive, viz. an excessive admiration for another poet, it is not so regrettable as his negative. That Wordsworth was, as Professor Saintsbury says, 'little of a prosodic innovator' * is true if you use the word 'prosody' in its narrowest and most literal sense. But, as a versifier, Wordsworth's use of the ode would alone constitute him an innovator. It is impossible in the space at our disposal to justify this pronouncement. It would need, to do so, a very careful examination of the technical achievements of Wordsworth in some of his greatest odes. Some hint, however, to men of good will to understand the framework of poetry in its relation to the content of poetry is afforded by a mere juxtaposition of a characteristic fragment from Gray and one from Wordsworth. No finer fragment can be found in all Gray's odes than the 'Theban eagle' passage—if only the setting of it were as worthy:

'Hark, his hands the lyre explore!
Bright-eyed Fancy hovering o'er
Scatters from her pictured urn
Thoughts, that breathe, and words, that burn.
But ah! 'tis heard no more—
O Lyre divine, what daring spirit
Wakes thee now? Though he inherit
Nor the pride, nor ample pinion,
That the Theban eagle bear
Sailing with supreme dominion
Through the azure deep of air:
Yet oft before his infant eyes would run
Such forms, as glitter in the Muses' ray;
With orient hues, unborrowed of the sun;
Yet shall he mount and keep his distant way.'

Keeping, in the Wordsworth quotation, to an ode in the

* Vol. iii. p. 175.

Pindaric form (what Gray and Collins and so forth imagined to be the Pindaric form), one cannot do better than take from the 'Immortality' ode:

'Thou whose exterior semblance doth belie
Thy soul's immensity;
Thou best philosopher, who yet dost keep
Thy heritage, thou eye amongst the blind,
That, deaf and silent, read'st the eternal deep
Haunted for ever by the eternal mind—
Mighty Prophet! Seer blest!
On whom those truths do rest
Which we are toiling all our lives to find,
In darkness lost, the darkness of the grave;
Thou, over whom thine Immortality
Broods like the day, a master o'er a slave. . . .'

But as Wordsworth's muse is really rather hampered by an inherited form, the severe splendour of his verse is best given by the beginning of 'Duty':

'Stern daughter of the voice of God!
O Duty! If that name thou love
Who art a light to guide, a rod
To check the erring, and reprove;
Thou, who art victory and law
When empty terrors overawe;
From vain temptations dost set free;
And calm'st the weary strife of frail humanity.'

The differences between Gray's and Wordsworth's lines ought to be at once apparent. Gray never wholly frees himself from the grimace of the eighteenth-century ode—Pope's grimace, but Dryden's grimace too. All that has utterly disappeared in Wordsworth. The Pindaric tradition has indeed seduced Wordsworth into the two false-sounding shorts, 'Mighty Prophet,' etc. in the first passage given. To make up for this we have following the two short lines, one of quite supreme quality:

'Which we are toiling all our lives to find'—

a line which has a close kinship in structure, in cadence, and in simplicity with

'To the wet sea-boy in an hour so rude,'

with which alone can it be compared.

With Keats, Professor Saintsbury is in much closer sympathy, so that he expresses Keats' prosodic developement in a different fashion:

'He gives expression to the revolt which accompanies his discipleship [revolt of course from the 'rocking-horse' couplet and Boileau's rules for verse] with a definite precept-protest in the well-known 'Sleep and Poetry' quite early. That discipleship itself—to Leigh Hunt; to Leigh Hunt's masters, the Jacobean and Caroline enjambers; to Spenser, to Chapman—is placarded all over the 'Juvenilia' and 'Endymion.' The way in which, finding his education—his prosodic education—imperfect, he turns to Milton and Dryden for alteratives, astringents, tonics, is equally well known; as are the magnificent results when he has made the whole teaching his, and has emerged from school (alas! not for long) in such things as the "Eves," "La Belle Dame sans Merci," the great odes and the last sonnets.'

This is all true enough. But it is also true that Keats' great contribution to prosody—that external and measurable prosody in which Wordsworth is declared to have innovated so little—is the flowing couplet of 'Endymion.' For nothing quite like it is to be found elsewhere. Its very defects are a part of this verse as a contribution to English prosody. If Keats had tried astringents on this medium it would have been something different, less unique. Tennyson has written the same kind of thing since in blank verse, but no one had done much like it before. Keats' 'spenserians' are for their age unique, too, more like their model—as Professor Saintsbury truly says—than anything of Shelley's, and of course far more than Byron's. But that is hardly a merit in itself. Grant that Keats was in a sense the one true romantic of this second Renaissance age, that he had, as he had, more of kinship to Spenser than any other poet after Spenser, have we not seen that Spenser himself was too much of a romantic, and that his verse, his prosody itself, wanted the steel girders which encounter with hard fact and contemporary emotion gave to the verse of the dramatists? 'Romanticism,' indeed, was a rather fatal legacy of Keats to his successors. It affected all Tennyson's verse deeply.

From the early joint work of the Tennysons—the 'Poems by Two Brothers' and the 'Lover's Tale' therein—Professor Saintsbury takes 'almost at random' the following passage:

'Gleams of the water circles, as they broke,
Flickered like doubtful smiles about her lips.
Quivered a dying glory on her hair,
Leapt like a passing thought across her eyes;
And mine with one which will not pass till earth
And heaven pass too, dwelt on *my* heaven—a face
Most starry-fair, but kindled from within
As 'twere with dawn.

This is no doubt already very beautiful, of the still-life beauty which is generally Keats' likewise.

'It will be observed,' says Professor Saintsbury, 'that the phrase starts admirably, that the contrast of the single-moulded form of the opening and the run-on close is admirable too, but that it does not actually finish quite as well.' What is also obvious, and the main reason why our author selects this passage, is that we are here simply in the verse of the 'Idylls' in a slightly earlier form. To make ourselves fully conscious of what this poetry lacks (a necessary if an ungracious procedure), we have only to look back to the passages of blank verse from Marlowe and Shakespeare given a short time since. Or, if that test seem unfair on account of the difference of the subject, take a much inferior passage from Shakespeare which yet establishes our point :

'Tis her breathing that
Perfumes the chamber thus : the flame o' the taper
Bows towards her, and would underpeep her lids,
To see the enclosed lights, now canopied
Under these windows white and azure laced
With blue of heaven's own tinct.*₁

Now this is not Shakespeare in a very sincere mood. Shakespeare in his less sincere moods is always 'conceited' as here. For the occasion is not inciting to much feeling ; and Iachimo is a minor character whose emotions do not greatly interest Shakespeare. But, prosodically, how much superior to Tennyson the passage is ; how unmisty, how direct and 'real !'

It is not worth while citing for comparison a passage from Milton, such as the description of Eve :

'She as a veil down to her slender waist
Her unadorned golden tresses wore,' etc.

Milton's prosodic strength is so godlike. This second line alone,

'Her unadorned golden tresses wore,'

is supreme. And yet female beauty was not a very inspiring theme to Milton, as it was to Tennyson and Keats. We have said that the just-quoted verse of Tennyson's is really one in kind with the verse of 'Endymion,' and on a higher level with the verse of 'The Eve of St. Agnes.' All have about them a dreamy sweetness which may perhaps be fairly distinguished as the true

* Cymbeline, act ii. sc. 2.

'romantic' note. So using the word 'romantic' we get just what we need, a term which through many members links these poets on to Spenser and his school.* But in that sense 'romantic' does not apply to Coleridge. It is not 'subject' that gives this dreamy character to verse, but 'subjectivity.' 'Kubla Khan,' for instance, though a dream, has nothing to say to it :

'Where Alph, the sacred river, ran,
Through caverns measureless to man,
Down to a sunless sea.'

Compare this with some passage from 'St. Agnes,' the 'warm gules' one, or to the succeeding stanza,

'Anon her heart revives,' etc.

and we see at once the difference in versification.

The influence of Keats on modern verse has been very great, and is not yet exhausted. Within the compass of Professor Saintsbury's history it may be said to end with Swinburne. Of this last poet our author very early shows himself a great admirer. This is, we guess, the positive reason of his non-appreciation of Wordsworth. The two poets are far divided. When Professor Saintsbury comes to deal with Swinburne at his proper place in the history, he rises to as near eloquence as he ever attains, in the praise of that marvel, 'Atalanta in Calydon.'

'In the "Atalanta" choruses there was nothing the least imitative of [Tennyson or Browning]. And there was a quality which Tennyson had seldom displayed, and which Browning, though he showed it sometimes, did not often employ in his best lyrics—the quality of speed. Further, this speed was the speed not merely of the runner but of the dancer; a motion miraculously combining the undulation and gyration, which usually require somewhat slow progression, with the utmost rapidity, yet never making slip or slur. "When the hounds of Spring are on Winter's traces" made an actual *renouveau* of English prosody, and sent a fresh pack of verse hounds bounding and doubling, and though not "slow in pursuit,"

* Should we dub 'romantic' this Spenserian element as it really is in Keats and Tennyson (and certainly in the common use of words there is nothing against our doing so), then we must distinguish it sharply from the 'romanticism' of French literature. This is not always sincere. But there is nothing dreamy about it; least of all about the 'Légende,' Victor Hugo's greatest monument. De Musset's romanticism comes nearer to the Keats type.

“matched in the mouth like bells,” through wood and over field of the poetic country.’*

The last image is very happy; for Theseus’ hunt and Atalanta’s are ‘in like material.’ The criticism too as criticism is acute and just: though it will be noted that even here, with all his enthusiasm behind him, Professor Saintsbury’s style contrives rather to belittle his theme than raise it. To one fresh from reading the chorus which our author cites, or some of the other great passages from ‘Atalanta,’ ‘O that I now, I too, were,’ or ‘But thou, O mother—The dreamer of dreams,’ the talk about dancing and gyration would come like a cold douche. Professor Saintsbury’s enthusiasm is great both for Tennyson and Swinburne, *the* poets, one may guess, of his early poetry-reading years: it is too great weighed in the strict scales of justice. It is an ungracious task to disparage in any degree the last among the famous poets of our land, the last to be numbered in the illustrious company of whom

‘*l’onorata nominanza*
Che di lor suon su nella nostra vita’

demands ‘gracia’ of heaven itself. But it is also unfair and dangerous to blink the fact that the metre of Swinburne expresses very clearly a prosodic decay in England, which corresponds to or foretells the very visible latter-day decay among us in all literary judgement and taste. The note which Swinburne first struck in the chorus which Professor Saintsbury cites—and which was so new and interesting then—grew to be the dominant one in all his verse, and is his chief poetic and prosodic legacy. Swinburne tried an infinity of metres. He was extremely imitative, and, with his great gift of words and a certain facility which goes with the imitative tendency, he achieved a measure of success, avoided at the worst all appearance of failure in every one of these metres. No sooner had the cult of old French forms arisen, than Swinburne was able to publish his ‘Century of Roundels’; and when ‘Omar Khayyám’ had taken the town, he wrote the Omar quatrain with facility and grace. He was indeed eminently, in the language of old French verse, a *docte poète*. His blank verse, as Professor Saintsbury says, ‘has always been of fine quality and more penetrated with direct ‘study of the Elizabethans than perhaps that of anyone.’ But, alas! how lifeless! It is, as Portia says, a sin to be a mocker. Yet is there not a premonition of Mr. Kipling and

* Vol. iii. p. 335.

his pocket divinity in such lines as these, which are meant to express the height of passion ?

‘ Doth God think
How shall I be without you ? What strange breath
Shall my days draw, what strange blood feed my life
When this life that is love is gone from them
And this light lost ? ’ *

Whoso does not feel this, let him go back but for one half-minute to Cleopatra and her ‘ curled Antony.’

In nine-tenths of Swinburne’s verse there is something of the same note as in the lines just quoted—a straining after passion, an effort to be strong which has deceived many of the elect. The very width of Swinburne’s literary sympathies, at any rate the ease with which he could rouse a seeming enthusiasm, was no good sign. Professor Saintsbury is apt to assume, not without arrogance, that if some poet who pleases him does not please his reader the fault must lie with the latter, that he is ‘ hard to ‘please or (with pardon) not worth pleasing.’ But there must always be individual tastes, and to take delight in everything is to care greatly for nothing :

‘ She liked whate’er
She looked on, and her looks went everywhere.’

That may be pretty for a girl just entering life, not for a man with matured tastes. That Goethe failed to see merit in Hugo and Coleridge in Tennyson, surely these things take away all prerogative from a gift of indiscriminate or even of wide admiration ?

Now, out of the sum of Swinburne’s achievement it is the rapid verse of the kind which is foreshadowed by ‘ When the ‘ hounds of Spring ’ chorus—it is this that has survived as his chief prosodic gift to us. How successfully it has survived we see written all over the pages of Mr. Kipling’s verse, and again in the second degree in that of Mr. Kipling’s imitators, such as Mr. Newbolt. This is a sign of what might be described literally ‘ as phonetic decay ’ in our language : a sign that along with what we may optimistically call the ‘ broadening ’ of taste in all matters, there has gone a similar ‘ broadening ’ of aural sensibility. It is almost certain that of anyone who has been really ‘ captured ’ by this literature the ear would no longer rightly respond to the delicacies of great blank verse whether of the dramatists or of Milton, nor to the best of our

* Bothwell, act iv. sc. 3.

lyric. And fine as is Professor Saintsbury's critical sense and just his ear, we suspect that even he has been affected rather injuriously by his early admirations in poetry—by Tennyson to some extent, by Swinburne much more. To the Caroline lyricists he gives, we think, more laud than is their due, seeing that all things are by comparison. And we are sure that he is too enthusiastic over the 'In Memoriam' metre. We are not convinced that this metre has *in se* any advantage over the 'common measure,' or that the charm it possesses comes from aught else than its novelty. So if 'In Memoriam' metre ever became as hackneyed as 'common measure' has done, it would lose its charm, save (like common measure) in the great examples. There is little if any 'sweep' in this metric form, carrying us forward, will we, nil we, such as there is in the Spenserian stanza. On the contrary, anything like a long narrative would, we believe, be intolerable in 'in-memoriams.' Tennyson saves his position by cutting up his poem into a series of short reflective observations. Some of these are indeed exquisite, some of those to which the expression 'reflective-observation' best applies, such as the 'old yew' passage. But when we have the reflection without the observation, *i.e.* not enfolded, as one may say, in some immediate outward experience, the verse is far less happy. Few nowadays can defend 'That each who seems a separate whole,' etc., or the entire canto which it begins, and that ends and sinks so tamely where it ought to rise—

' Farewell, we lose ourselves in light.'

Now, the fault of such passages, the weakness of 'In Memoriam' as a whole (beautiful passages apart), and of the 'Idylls' and of Tennyson's blank verse narratives on the whole, has one and the same origin—want of passion in the poet, want of a passionate hold even on Nature. Tennyson rises to greatness when he expresses the trained yet true emotions (patriotic and other) of the English gentleman ('A land of just and old renown'), rarely in things quite personal and individual. Save once, in 'Maud,' he seems in the region of love to follow very closely the Keats tradition, which is dreamlike. If we are to have a true, and that means a justly balanced history of English prosody, we are bound to take note of these defects in the moderns, and not let mere perspective magnify what is near and belittle what is past. Of Browning it is not possible to take account alongside of Tennyson and Swinburne; for in a large degree Browning is like the Emperor Sigismund *supra*

grammaticam, above prosody. He would have to begin with a new study of that technique, who attempted to do justice to Browning.

Here we are obliged very unwillingly to part company with a subject of endless interest, and with Professor Saintsbury. The author of this 'History of English Prosody' has given us the results of great learning and of fine discrimination and sound understanding, which are of even more importance than learning. Some things he has settled for all time: he has thoroughly based *οὐν*. The vitality of true music, true rhythm which in one age was of force to triumph over the bleakness of Skeltonism and in another over the aridity of Popedom, and to save the glory of English verse—this, which historians of rhythm are so apt to misunderstand, he understands. That he is needlessly pedantic is to be regretted, for this will turn away some readers from his admirable pages.

ART. II.—THE UNITED STATES AND THE TARIFF.

1. *Republican Text Book for the Congressional Campaign, 1910.* Issued by the Republican Congressional Committee. 1133 Broadway, New York.
2. *Democratic Campaign Book for 1910.* Published by the National Democratic Congressional Committee, Washington, D.C.

THERE was only one issue in the State and Congressional elections in the United States in November 1910. In those States where Legislatures were elected which will in the winter of 1910–11 choose members of the Senate at Washington; and in all Congressional districts, the only issue was the Payne-Aldrich tariff. The Republican revision of the tariff in the extra session of Congress of 1909 was everywhere the issue; and never did an opposition at Washington secure a majority in the House of Representatives, and reduce the majority in the Senate, with less effort than at the elections in November last. In the new Congress, which will convene in December 1911, the Democratic majority in the House will be sixty-three. In the Senate, as the result of the State elections, there will be eight fewer Republicans than there are in the Senate as now constituted; and as a consequence new power will accrue to the Republican group known since the revision of the tariff as Insurgents.

The history of the agitation of 1906–8 which impelled Mr. Taft and the Republican leaders in the House and the Senate to reopen the tariff question, and the history of the revision itself, have been told in the pages of this *Review* [Article 10, No. 427 *Edinburgh Review*, 'Tariff Revision in the United States,' pp. 70–93; and Article 1, No. 430, 'The Revision of the United States Tariff,' pp. 269–302]; and to readers of the second of these articles the overwhelming defeat of the Republican party at the first election after the revision can scarcely have come as a surprise. Concerning the Payne-Aldrich Act, which was the work almost exclusively of Senators Aldrich and Lodge, and the stand-pat group of Republicans in the Senate, this statement was made in the issue of the *Edinburgh Review* for October 1909:—

'About all that is good that can be said for the Tariff Act of 1909 is that it must constitute a new starting-point for a measure that shall end the corruption of the protective system as this corruption

was developed and became increasingly widespread between 1861 and 1909. With the uplift in Federal politics that characterised Mr. Roosevelt's terms as President, Aldrichism and all that it means in American political life is obviously coming to an end. Mr. Taft gave no aid to this new movement. In his handling of the tariff he showed himself to be merely a politician, without any realisation of what the country expected of him, devoid as a President of courageous sincerity and devotion to political principle. He disappointed more of the rank and file of the Republican party than any President since the Civil War, and altogether failed to make adequate use of the great opportunity that Mr. Roosevelt had left to him.'

Even for the Republican party when its hold on the country was infinitely stronger than it was during the first decade of the nineteenth century, revision of the tariff in an upward direction was always a hazardous undertaking. Such a revision, as a matter of course, satisfied the protected interests, which since 1861 have been closely allied with the Republican party, and generally represented in its inner councils as well as in the House of Representatives and the Senate. But a revision that thus satisfied the comparatively few beneficiaries of tariff largesse usually provoked popular discontent; and the discontent made itself felt at the first election that followed revision. Such was the case when the McKinley tariff was enacted by the Republicans in 1890. There was more protection in the McKinley Act than there had been in any Tariff Act heretofore on the statute book. At the Congressional elections in November of that year, the tariff was the only issue. The Republicans then suffered a reverse as serious as that which overwhelmed them in November last year; and at the Presidential election in 1892, with the tariff again the only issue, the late Mr. Grover Cleveland was elected President, and the Republicans were in opposition until after the Congressional and Presidential elections of 1896. Following that success the Republicans again revised the tariff. The Dingley tariff enacted in the extra session of 1897 was even more protectionist than the McKinley Act; but in 1898 there was the war with Spain over Cuba; and only the war saved the Republicans from defeat at the Congressional elections in November of that year.

The Dingley tariff was revised in the extra session of Congress that was convened in March 1909, just as soon as Mr. Taft was inaugurated President. No other legislation was attempted at this extra session, which was called in compliance with the pledge for an immediate revision of the tariff embodied in the platform of the Republican party adopted at the National

Convention at St. Louis in June 1908. In the ordinary session of Congress—which began in December 1909 and ended in July 1910—there was an unusually large volume of legislation. Much of it—such as the Act which enlarged the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission and brought interstate telegraphs and telephones under the regulation of the Commission, the Act extending the protection afforded railway workers by compelling the use of safety appliances, and the Act establishing post-office savings-banks on the English model—was of a commendable character and was enacted in response to public demand. Had political conditions in the United States been normal in November 1910, this legislation would have been helpful to Mr. Taft and the Republican party at the Congressional elections. But conditions were not normal. Political discontent from August 1909 to November 1910 was more widespread than at any time since the enactment of the McKinley tariff in 1890; and the discontent was much more obvious than it was after the enactment of the McKinley tariff.

Popular resentment against the Taft Administration and against the Republican party was evident in the newspapers and in the popular magazines which have such enormous circulations in the United States. It cropped out wherever two or three men not in politics began to discuss political conditions; and most remarkable of all in a country where by-elections to Congress usually attract no popular attention outside the constituencies concerned, this resentment against the Republican party showed itself between August 1909 and November 1910, in reverses for the Republicans at by-elections in Missouri, in New York State, and in Massachusetts, and in the popular reception of these defeats of Republican candidates for Congress.

All this popular discontent originated in the revision of the tariff in the extra session of 1909. All this resentment was due to the pretence of the leaders of the stand-pat group at Washington that the pledge of the Republican party in National Convention in 1908 had been loyally and amply fulfilled. The Republican stand-patters from May 1906 to May 1908 continuously and resolutely opposed any reopening of the tariff question. Demand for revision at that time, it may be recalled, came almost exclusively from manufacturers at the secondary stages of industry, who complained of the high prices they were compelled to pay for their raw materials under the Dingley tariff. There was little popular demand for revision between 1906 and 1908, chiefly because ordinary consumers are and must be inarticulate because they are unorganised. Manufacturers, however, are organised in both State and National

associations ; and it was because they are organised, and, moreover, because most of the protesting manufacturers of 1906-8 were of the Republican party, that finally, in May 1908, the stand-pat leaders in the House and Senate agreed that the question should be reopened, and that at the National Convention in 1908 the Republican party should commit itself to **an** immediate revision of the tariff.

For the Republican party as a whole, and certainly for the success of Mr. Taft's term as President, it would have been decidedly better had the stand-pat group had their way in the Congressional session of 1908, and the tariff question had been left without reopening as long as the Republicans were in control of the Administration and of Congress. Only reluctantly did the stand-patters in the House and Senate give way at the end of a long-maintained agitation for the revision of the Dingley Act ; and when they did give way at this stage, and also at the Republican National Convention, there was an obvious agreement among them that if the Republicans were successful in the Presidential elections of 1908, and were again in control of the House and the Senate, the protected interests should lose nothing of the least material value to them by the enactment of a new tariff. The guiding principle with these Republican stand-patters—these leaders at Washington who could not or would not see any reason for revising the Dingley Act—was that revision should be made by the friends of the tariff ; and the leaders of the stand-pat group in the Senate—Messrs. Aldrich and Lodge—acted to the full on this principle from the time the new tariff went from the House of Representatives to the Senate until the Bill was signed by President Taft in August 1909.

Stand-patters were adequately represented on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives that held public hearings on the tariff in the early winter of 1908, and which between December 1908 and March 1909 framed the new tariff. Mr. Sereno E. Payne, of New York, was chairman of this committee. He is a strong protectionist, or he would never have been chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means of a House in which the Republicans had a large majority. But a perusal of the voluminous minutes of the tariff hearings of this committee makes it obvious that Mr. Payne was disposed to work loyally to the pledge in the Republican National platform ; and although Mr. John Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Tawney, of Michigan, both stand-patters, were of the Committee of Ways and Means, the Bill as framed by this committee, and as passed by the House of Representatives, made some

concessions to the popular demand which had developed between June 1908 and March 1909 that there should be reductions of advantage to consumers as well as reductions which would be helpful to the manufacturers at secondary stages of industry with whom the demand for revision had originated in 1906.

The Bill, even as it was framed by the Committee of Ways and Means and passed by the House of Representatives, would not long have satisfied consumers, who, by this time, had become interested in tariff revision for two reasons. The first of these reasons grew out of the tariff hearings in November and December 1908. These made plain (1) the enormities of the textile schedules, and in particular the enormities and the jobbery of the wool schedule of the tariff of 1897; (2) the fact that as a result of the developement of the trusts between 1897 and 1908 there was little or no competition between American manufacturers in most lines of industry; and (3) that many manufacturers were continuously and systematically selling the output of their factories abroad at lower prices than in the home market that was closely protected for them by the tariff. These revelations constitute one reason why the Tariff Bill as passed by the House of Representatives would not for long have satisfied consumers. The second reason why there must soon have been another revision, even had the Senate accepted the Bill as it was sent to them, was the great and continuous increase in the cost of living—of food supplies and all home and personal equipment—that began about this time to attract widespread public attention and give rise to almost equally widespread discontent.

Had the Payne Bill been passed by the Senate exactly as it went from the House of Representatives, it would have effected no settlement of the tariff question that could have lasted for more than three or four years. It afforded some relief to manufacturers at secondary stages of industry—chiefly in the iron and steel industries—as it was intended to do, and as could be done, without in the least jeopardising the interests of the United States Steel Corporation and the other gigantic concerns at the primary stages of the industry. Some reductions were also made in the lumber schedules, in which the duties against imports from Canada had been scandalously high since the preceding revision in 1897. The duty imposed on hides in 1897, and of advantage chiefly to the great meat-packing houses of Chicago, St. Louis, and Kansas City, while admittedly of little value to the raisers of beef cattle, was repealed in response to the demands of the boot and shoe

manufacturers at the Massachusetts centres of the shoe trade.

But this removal of the duty on hides, strongly resisted by the packing houses, was about the only change in the tariff that could by any chance reach the general consumer. Notwithstanding the astounding revelations of the public hearings of the Committee of Ways and Means as to the underground methods used in framing the wool schedule of the Dingley tariff, and the equally astounding revelations of the outrageously high protection that this schedule afforded to the woollen industry of New England, and the hardship it imposed on middle and working class purchasers of woollen clothing, there was no change in the woollen duties of the least value to consumers when the Tariff Bill was sent from the House of Representatives to the Senate. Moreover, the high duties of the Dingley Act on cotton and silk goods were all re-embodied in the House Bill; so that apart from the removal of the duty on hides, if the Bill had been accepted by the Senate exactly as it had passed the House, only a few manufacturers at the secondary stages of industry could have pointed to any real advantage accruing from the revision.

There were at this time three distinct groups in the Senate: (1) the stand-pat Republicans who had been opposed to the reopening of the tariff question; (2) the Insurgents from the Western States, who had forced the stand-patters to give way on the question of revision; and the Senators of the Democratic minority, representing chiefly the Southern States which always elect Democratic Governors, State Legislatures, and Congressmen and Senators. The stand-pat Republicans were in a majority and were in control of the Committee on Finance to which the Tariff Bill was referred as soon as it was received by the Senate. Senator Aldrich, of Rhode Island, was chairman of the committee, and his most important associate, both in the committee and on the floor of the Senate, was Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts.

Before the Committee of Ways and Means of the House framed the new Tariff Bill it was occupied for six weeks in giving public hearings in Washington. Manufacturers and consumers, advocates of the existing duties or of higher duties, as well as advocates of lower duties, appeared at these hearings at the rate of twelve or fifteen a day. Newspaper reporters were admitted; and each day an official verbatim report of all the proceedings was published. There was no such publicity when the Bill reached the Senate Committee on Finance. Scores of manufacturers who had appeared before the

Committee of Ways and Means at the public hearings had interviews with the Senate Committee, or with the chairman, or other influential Republican members of the committee. But all these interviews were in private. Only surmises could be made of the pleas which were thus submitted to Senator Aldrich and his committee; but the result of these proceedings was a new Bill in which some of the reductions made by the House of Representatives were ignored, and in which—notably in the cotton and silk schedules—there were large increases over the Dingley rates in the protection afforded manufacturers.

Republican as well as Democratic and independent newspapers protested frequently and insistently against such methods as these in tariff-making, and urged the adoption of the Bill of the House of Representatives. But the stand-pat Republican Senators, conscious that high protection was more generally and more widely assailed than at any time since 1890, conscious also of the fact that there was Insurgency on the tariff among Republicans in the House and in the Senate, and Insurgency, moreover, in more than half the newspapers that ordinarily support the Republican party, determined that at any cost the tariff should once more be revised only by its friends; and the reverses of the Republican party at the elections in November 1910, with the likelihood that in 1912 a Democratic President will succeed Mr. Taft, are directly due to the control that Senators Aldrich and Lodge were able to exercise over the Tariff Bill, and the extreme stand-pat spirit in which these two New England Senators exercised the enormous power which they were able to wield in the Senate in the session of 1909.

Senator Aldrich had the support of Mr. Taft in all that he undertook at this time. Mr. Taft committed himself to the stand-patters just as soon as Congress was convened in extra session in March 1909. The first contest within the Republican party after Mr. Taft became President came when the new Congress was organised, and a Speaker had to be elected, and rules of procedure adopted. Except among the Republican stand-patters there was in Congress and in the country a strong objection to Mr. Joseph Cannon, of Illinois, serving again as Speaker. He was the foremost stand-patter in the House of Representatives; and he is a Republican politician of a type of which few representatives now survive. Tens of thousands of Republicans all over the country were hopeful that Mr. Cannon would fail of re-election for Congress in November 1908; and scores of Republican newspapers gave expression to the hope that the Republican party would be

finally rid of him. Mr. Cannon has, however, a strong hold on his constituency. He was re-elected in 1908, and again in 1910, although with a Democratic majority in the House of Representatives his career as Speaker will end in March 1911, when the existing Congress finishes its two years' term. Following Mr. Cannon's re-election to Congress in 1908 there was the hope that the Insurgents of the Republican party might defeat him when he was a candidate for the Speakership. But Mr. Taft then threw in his lot with the stand-patters and against the Insurgents, who for nearly two years afterwards were deprived by the President of the patronage in their Congressional districts that ordinarily goes to the members of the majority in the House of Representatives. It was only on the eve of the elections of 1910 that Mr. Taft publicly announced that he had abandoned this policy of punishing the Insurgents by depriving them of Federal patronage.

In so allying himself, in March 1909, with the stand-patters and with their leader in the House, Mr. Taft made the initial mistake of his Presidential term. It is a mistake from which he has not yet recovered, and is not likely to recover. Mr. Taft failed to see that by March 1909 the movement for lower duties was enormously wider than it had been when it was a movement only of manufacturers at the secondary stages of industry harassed by the arbitrarily high cost of their raw material. It had apparently not been borne in upon him in March 1909, when Congress assembled in extra session, solely to revise the tariff, and the House was electing its Speaker, that tariff revision downward was at that time much more critical for the Administration and for the Republican party than it was in June 1908, when he was nominated as the Republican candidate for President, and the party committed itself for the first time in its fifty-four years of existence to a downward revision.

The public hearings of the Ways and Means Committee extending over six weeks in the winter of 1908 had been reported at much length by newspapers all over the country; and particular attention had been given by the newspapers to the scandal of the wool schedule, to the sale of manufactures abroad at lower prices than in the United States, and to Mr. Carnegie's evidence when the iron and steel schedules were before the committee. Willingly or unwillingly, the Committee of Ways and Means had done much for popular political education in November and December 1908, preceding Mr. Taft's inauguration. It had done more in this direction than any other Congressional committee in the last quarter of a

century—much more than is usually done by a session of Congress; for in the United States public attention is not continuously focussed on Congress as public attention in England is focussed on Parliament.

High prices were beginning to make themselves universally felt in the winter of 1908-9, and the public investigations of the Committee of Ways and Means into the details of the textile schedules and their effect on prices for clothing threw much light on the loss in the working power of the dollar. While the Committee was still holding its public sessions, and while Mr. Roosevelt was still President, Mr. Taft in one of his public utterances had drawn attention to its proceedings, and expressed the hope that consumers would make their views known to the committee. Mr. Taft must have known that consumers are inarticulate and unorganised. This was evident before the Committee of Ways and Means reached the end of its work on the tariff that was done in public; for, unless the shoe manufacturers urging the repeal of the duty on hides, and the clothing manufacturers assailing the high duties on woollens, are regarded as consumers, there was no representation from consumers against the rates of the Dingley tariff. But while Mr. Taft's appeal, of November 1908, to consumers to lay their case before the Committee of Ways and Means was necessarily unheeded, the fact that he made it was popularly understood to mean that he was in favour of such reductions in the tariff as would reach consumers.

Any such expectations—any expectations that Mr. Taft would throw his influence in favour of a downward revision—were quickly dispelled in March 1909. Mr. Taft then threw the full weight of his influence as President in favour of Mr. Cannon in his contest for the Speakership, and Mr. Cannon, among Republicans in the constituencies and with a large section of the Republican press the most distrusted member of the House of Representatives, was re-elected Speaker.

Mr. Taft's action at this crisis meant that thereafter he was ranged with the stand-patters, and so consistently did he pursue this policy, that, as has been stated, he withheld patronage from members of the Insurgent groups in the House and the Senate, and Insurgent Republican Senators ceased to call on Mr. Taft for conference with him at the White House. Mr. Taft ranged himself with Senators Aldrich and Lodge at the critical stage of the Bill—that is, when there was a conference between the two Houses on the Bill, and about all that consumers owe to Mr. Taft in connexion with the revision of 1909 was that he secured the repeal of the duty on hides for which the

shoe manufacturers of New England had put forward urgent claims at the public hearings of the Committee of Ways and Means in November 1908. In the House Bill this concession was made to the New England shoe industry. But in the Senate the stand-patters reinserted the duty, and it was only at conference stage, when Mr. Taft finally intervened on behalf of free hides, that the stand-pat group in the Senate gave way.

This was about all that Mr. Taft did on behalf of such a revision as would carry advantage to consumers. In his later speeches in defence of the Payne-Aldrich Act he admitted the enormities of the woollen schedule. These must have been known to him if he read the official verbatim reports of the hearings before the Committee of Ways and Means. But he made no persistent efforts to secure lower duties in the woollen schedule, and he offered no persistent opposition to the duties on cotton and silk goods that, in the Payne-Aldrich Bill, as finally passed, were much higher—much more protective than in the Dingley Act. From the time the Bill went from the House to the Senate its fortunes were exclusively in the control of Senators Aldrich and Lodge, and their fellow stand-patter Senators, and among these the most zealous supporters of Messrs. Aldrich and Lodge were the Senators from Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, Ohio, and all the New England States.

There never was a Tariff Bill in which the protectionist interests of the New England States were better safeguarded than in the Bill which in the summer of 1909 was enacted almost exclusively by the stand-pat Republicans in the Senate. The wool schedule was left as it stood in the Dingley tariff, chiefly for the advantage of the woollen manufacturers of Massachusetts and Connecticut, although some of the gain accrued to the industry in Pennsylvania. Massachusetts and Rhode Island were the only States to profit from the higher duties on cotton goods. Connecticut and New Jersey manufacturers alone profited from the higher duties on silks; and the higher duties on watch parts were of advantage chiefly to the industry in Massachusetts. Except that the duties on raw wool are of great advantage to the sheep-raising States beyond the Mississippi River, the revision of 1909 was made from the standpoint of the protected interests in the States on the Atlantic seaboard, from Pennsylvania to Maine, and the significant feature of the elections in November 1910 is that, except in Pennsylvania, it was in these Atlantic Coast States that the Republican party suffered its greatest and its most unexpected reverses.

Tariff legislation necessarily raises sectional issues. It has always done so in the United States, and it is having the same

effect in Canada, as is evident by the uprising of the farmers of the grain-growing provinces against the Dominion tariff of 1907. The Insurgents in the Senate are from the West. They realised how Senators Aldrich and Lodge at the revision of 1909 were framing the tariff schedules in the interest of New England manufacturers. So did the people in these Western States; with the result that one of the effective slogans in the Congressional campaign of 1910 was the complaint that New England had used its power in the Senate to enable New England manufacturers to levy an increased toll on consumers in the Western States.

New England, through the fact that Senator Aldrich is from Rhode Island, and Senator Lodge from Massachusetts, obviously dominated the revision of 1909. There was not a single Insurgent Senator—not a single Senator from the Atlantic seaboard States north of Maryland—who was of the Insurgent Republicans or of the Democratic party. Not a single Senator from these ten Atlantic coast States—Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine—was on the popular side in the contests in the Senate on the Tariff Bill in the summer of 1909, the Bill which, by reason of the power that the Senate has drawn to itself in all financial legislation, was being framed almost exclusively by the Senate, and in many of its details was being so framed in opposition to the will of the Republican majority in the House of Representatives.

There were scores of divisions on the schedules when the Senate was in committee on the Tariff Bill. But in all these divisions the Senators from the Atlantic seaboard States, and the stand-patters from Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan, voted as a unit with Senators Aldrich and Lodge, who were in charge of the Bill. Nothing was conceded to the Insurgent group of Republican Senators. An amendment in favour of a lower rate of duty moved by an Insurgent Republican Senator had no more chance of acceptance than a similar amendment moved by a Democratic Senator. In the Senate, as at the White House, the Insurgent Republican Senators were ignored; and the Tariff Bill as finally enacted was essentially the work of Senators Aldrich and Lodge and the stand-patters who so loyally stood by them whenever an Insurgent or a Democratic Senator called for a division on an amendment the purpose of which was to secure that the revision should be bona-fide, and should embody reductions in duties which would reach consumers.

There was no cessation in the condemnation of the Payne-

Aldrich Act from the time it was popularly realised how the stand-patters in the Senate intended to fulfil the pledge in the platform of the Republican party until the elections of November 1910. This time there was no war to divert popular attention, as it was diverted after the enactment of the Dingley tariff. The device of calling an extra session for the revision of the tariff in order to give the people time to forget before the next Congressional elections did not serve the Republican party. War against the Payne-Aldrich tariff was continued from May 1909 until the electoral campaign which brought about the defeat of the Republican party in the House of Representatives and the overthrow of eight of the stand-pat members of the Senate. During these eighteen months the Payne-Aldrich Act was assailed by three distinct forces. It was assailed by the Insurgent Republicans and by the Democrats; and finally it was assailed by the fifteen-cent magazines, which have such enormous popular circulations all over the United States.

Earlier in this article it was affirmed that the Democrats never secured an electoral triumph with less effort than at the State and Congressional elections in November 1910. The overwhelming success then, and the likelihood of success at the Presidential elections in 1912, have come with an ease that must be difficult to understand in England, where usually enormous propaganda work must be done by an Opposition before it can bring about the defeat of a Government that is in possession of a large majority in the House of Commons. For any such work against the Tariff Act of 1909 the Democratic party was badly placed and poorly equipped. It was in a minority in both Houses of Congress. It had no national leader—no man who occupied a place in the public eye comparable with that of Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Taft, the national leaders of the Republican party. It had not a single man, either in the House or the Senate, who, if he made a great speech on the tariff or on any other question in the constituencies, was of sufficient importance as a statesman to make it incumbent on the newspapers to report his speech verbatim, and to insure that the speech if so reported would be widely read.

Mr. Champ Clark showed himself an efficient and capable leader of the Democratic minority in the House of Representatives at both stages of the revision of the Dingley Act—at the public hearings in November and December; and later when the Tariff Bill, drawn up exclusively by Mr. Payne and the Republican majority of the Committee of Ways and Means,

was submitted to the House. Mr. Clark was leader of the Democratic minority on the Committee; and it was through his cross-examination of Mr. Whitman, of Boston, that the sordid details of the framing of the wool schedule by a small sub-committee of Republican Senators in 1897 were given such widespread publicity at the open sessions of the Committee of Ways and Means.

As floor leader of the Democratic minority in the House of Representatives, Mr. Clark was as effective when the Payne Bill was before the House as he had been at the public hearings of the Committee of Ways and Means—the only stage of the proceedings of this committee when it was possible for the Democratic minority to do any work of much practical value. Mr. Clark's reputation as leader of the Democratic minority in the House of Representatives was undoubtedly enhanced by the work he did at the public hearings, and when the Payne Bill was in the House. More than any Democrat, either in the House or the Senate, Mr. Clark showed on the Tariff Bill of 1909 qualities that stamped him as a leader—that make it as certain as anything can be in politics at Washington that he must become Speaker when the House of Representatives, elected in November 1910, convenes in December 1911, and organises for its two years' term. But Mr. Clark's success in the winter of 1908-9 did not bring him into any such position as a national leader of the Democratic party as Mr. W. J. Bryan held from 1896 to 1908.

As the Democratic campaign in the elections of 1910 proceeded, Mr. Woodrow Wilson came into much prominence. Mr. Wilson resigned his position as President of Princeton University, New Jersey, to become the Democratic candidate for Governor in that State. There, as in all the State elections, the tariff was the only national issue; and Mr. Wilson made some really effective speeches against the Payne-Aldrich Act and was elected Governor of New Jersey by a large majority. Both Mr. Woodrow Wilson and Mr. Champ Clark are almost certain to become national leaders of the Democratic party between now and the Presidential election in 1912. They may be rivals for nomination as the Presidential candidate of the Democratic party in July 1912; for since the late Mr. Cleveland retired from active political life at the end of his second term as President in 1897, the Democratic party has had no such promising national leader as either Mr. Clark or Mr. Wilson.

There was, however, no national leader of the Democratic party when the campaign against the Payne-Aldrich Act began in the summer of 1909; and in this campaign, as the elections

of 1910 drew near, there was another handicap for the Democratic party. Among electors of the older generation, and particularly among electors who before 1884 were of the Republican party, but who then, and again in 1892, voted with the Democrats, there was the recollection of the betrayal on the tariff of 1894. This was the year in which the McKinley Act of 1890 was revised by the Democrats. It was the widespread discontent with the McKinley Act that brought about the overthrow of the Republicans at the Congressional elections in 1890, and an even greater success for the Democrats at the Presidential and Congressional elections in November 1892. The net result of these repeated popular votes hostile to the high protection of the tariff of 1890 was that from 1893 to 1897 the administration was Democratic—Mr. Cleveland was President—and the Democrats for the first time since the civil war of 1861–65 were in control of the House and the Senate.

The popular mandate of 1890 and 1892 was that the tariff should be reformed in accordance with what had hitherto been the principle of the Democratic party—a tariff for revenue only. By the House of Representatives a Bill was framed and passed which went a long way towards fulfilling the ante-election pledges of Mr. Cleveland and the Democrats. But in 1894, as in 1909, the Senate intervened. The late Senator A. P. Gorman, of Maryland, in 1894 was much in the position of Senator Aldrich at the revision of 1909. Mr. Gorman was in control of the Democratic majority in the Senate; and he used his power in 1894 much as Senator Aldrich used the enormous and unchecked power that he wielded in the Senate in 1909. Senator Gorman used his control of the Senate to frustrate the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives—to undo the work on the tariff that had been done by the late Mr. William L. Wilson, of West Virginia, and his colleagues of the Democratic majority of the Committee of Ways and Means. Senator Gorman also frustrated the tariff policy of the late Mr. Cleveland. He was the barrier that stood in the way of an ample and loyal fulfilment of the pledges with regard to the tariff on which Mr. Cleveland had been elected; and his betrayal of the Democratic party drew from President Cleveland, in the form of a letter to Mr. Catchings, a Democratic Congressman from Mississippi, the most scathing denunciation of the sordid politics of tariff-making that has ever found its way into American newspapers.

The traditions of the Democratic party since 1894 were much against it with the older generation of independent voters when it began its campaign against the Payne-Aldrich Act; and the

propaganda work that really counted against the tariff of 1909, and brought about the defeat of the Republican party, was not so much what was done by the Democrats in the Congressional districts, as the propaganda against high protection, and in particular against the jobbery of the textile schedules, that was done between August 1909 and November 1910 by the Insurgent Republicans and the fifteen-cent magazines.

The attitude of the Insurgent Republicans towards the revision of 1909 can best be summarised by a brief quotation from a speech by the late Senator Dolliver, of Iowa, who died on the eve of the elections :

‘The past year,’ he said, in speaking of the extra session of Congress at which the Payne-Aldrich tariff was enacted, ‘has witnessed two events of unusual interest—the discovery of the North Pole by Dr. Cook, and the revision of the tariff downward by the Senator from Rhode Island—each in its way a unique hoax, and both promptly presented to the notice of the public by the highest official congratulations.’

Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, whose career in the Senate will come to an end in March 1911, because a Democratic Legislature was elected in that State in November 1910, was one of the most active of the Insurgent Republican members of the Senate during the session of 1909 when the tariff was revised. Mr. Beveridge continued in Indiana the campaign against the Payne-Aldrich Act which he began in the Senate. As a candidate for re-election to the Senate he was the most important speaker at the State Convention of the Republicans of Indiana, held at Indianapolis, on April 5, 1910 ; and his speech at the convention is of significance as showing how the more moderate protectionists of the Republican party regarded the revision of 1909 :

‘The Republicans of Indiana,’ said Mr. Beveridge, ‘are for a protective tariff which covers the difference in the cost of production here and abroad. Less than that is unjust to American labourers ; more than that is unjust to American consumers. Injustice is the only foe that protection needs to fear. It was to reduce the Dingley tariff to meet changed conditions and secure justice that we undertook revision. Every economic policy, every political system, almost every government, has been destroyed because of excesses and injustice that crept into it. The way to secure a policy, a system, or a government that in itself is good is to administer it with justice and wisdom. The only way to keep a party solid and growing is to keep it right and progressive. The great masses of Republican voters understand it to-day when

they refuse to permit the great doctrine of protection to be used to excuse and cloak tariff excess. Use a principle to perpetrate a fraud and the friend of the principle thus misused is more offended than the enemy of the principle himself.'

All three forces in the fight against the Payne-Aldrich Act—the insurgent Republicans, the Democrats, and the fifteen-cent magazines—by common consent concentrated their attacks on the woollen, cotton, and silk schedules. They attacked the woollen schedule because the injustice it works on consumers is nearly as old as the Republican policy of high protection; and they attacked the cotton schedule of the Payne-Aldrich Act because it was in this and in the silk schedule that the most daring concessions to the protected interests of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Jersey were made by Senators Aldrich and Lodge when the House Bill was recast by the Senate.

'Like President Taft,' said Senator Beveridge, when he came to deal with the textile schedules in his speech of April 5, at Indianapolis,

'I wanted the ancient woollen schedule reduced—a schedule forty-two years old, which, if ever right, long since has served its purpose, and which now gives to the woollen trust an unfair control of our markets; which oppresses the wool grower, raises the price and reduces the weight of the people's clothing. I stood against that schedule when we tried to reduce it when the Bill was passed, and I am against it now. I could not stand for an increase of duties on cotton cloth, the higher grades of which are used as clothing by every man, woman, and child, rich or poor, throughout the whole Republic. I could not stand for that without evidence, and when the manufacturers themselves formally declared before the House Committee that their business was thriving, their labour employed, and that all they asked was that the tariff on cottons should not be decreased, I stood against those increases on cotton goods when the schedule was voted on; I stood against them when the Bill was passed; and I stand against them now.'

'Compromise on purely economic details,' continued Senator Beveridge, 'is often wise; but compromise with sheer injustice is always wrong. I was for a law that would protect the wages of every working man in Indiana, and yet enable that working man to get his clothing and creature comforts cheaper—and such a law could have been written, and it shall be written. I was for a law that would have given every manufacturer in Indiana ample protection, and yet enable him to get his raw materials cheaper—and such a law could have been written, and it shall be written. I was for a law that would have taken the tariff out of the way of business for ten or a dozen years—and such a law could have been

written, and it shall be written. Business needs tariff stability, and only a satisfied people can give tariff stability. The dictates of justice are better for business than the dictates of bosses ; for the people obey justice and defy bosses.

It was for language like this towards the Payne-Aldrich tariff that it was suggested by some of the stand-pat Republicans in October that the Insurgent Republicans should be read out of the party. To this suggestion the late Senator Dolliver replied : ' It all depends on what you call the Republican party. ' It depends on whether the Republican party consists of the ' people or a sub-committee of the Senate. If it is the latter, ' we can't be read out of the party, for we were never in it. '

Senator Cummins, who was Mr. Dolliver's colleague from Iowa in the Senate, also made answer to the suggestion that the Insurgents should be read out of the party :

' There will,' he said, ' be no change in my position, no recession from the attitude I among others took during the tariff debates. The fight will go on ; and, if anything, it will probably be a broader and hotter fight in the future. I have found no reason to change my conviction that the present tariff law is not a genuine revision downward, and that it far from complies with the promise of the Republican party to reduce the rates to a figure that would cover only the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad and a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. '

The fifteen-cent magazines, like the Insurgent Republicans, concentrated their attack on the wool and cotton schedules. The proceedings before the Committee of Ways and Means, when the methods used in framing the wool schedule of the Dingley law were revealed, afforded much material for the writers of articles in the popular magazines. Tariff schedules are full of technical details. This is particularly the case with the wool and cotton schedules of the Payne-Aldrich Act. These details are not easy to comprehend at first reading. They are not intended to be popularly understood ; for if they were understood an end would long ago have been made to the extortion that for nearly two generations has been possible under the wool schedule of the tariffs for which the Republican party has been responsible since the civil war.

All the old statutory power to extort was continued to the woollen industry of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania at the revision of 1909 ; and the revision was made memorable in tariff history by the audacious increase in the already high protection afforded to the cotton industry of New England and to the silk industry of Connecticut and New Jersey. There

are cotton mills in most of the Southern States; but the increase in the duties was of no value to the Southern mills. They applied only to the finer grades of goods, which are made almost exclusively in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. The silk manufacturers were given higher protection in 1909 in response to their plea that silks were luxuries, and that as luxuries heavy duties should be imposed on all imported silks. Here again the gain accruing to the manufacturers went only to manufacturers in New Jersey and Connecticut; for these are the only States in which the silk industry has been established.

Tariff details, as has been stated, are difficult to understand at first sight. But the writers in the popular magazines were assigned all the pages they required to make these details popularly understood. They were writing for sympathetic audiences, for people who were feeling the burden of the general upward movement in prices and for the people who suffered from the amazingly high prices for woollen clothing and domestic equipment, of wool, due to the wool schedule of Republican tariffs—and the propaganda against the tariff of 1909, undertaken by the popular magazines, was even more effective than the speeches of the Insurgent Republicans and the Democratic candidates for Congress. These American fifteen-cent magazines have no counterpart in the popular literature of England. Unlike the newspapers, they are allied to no political party, but they are usually hostile to 'the interests.' They concern themselves to a very large extent with politics, economics, and sociology. It is their mission to make these subjects popularly understood; and in this work, as regards the tariff of 1909, they certainly succeeded.

There are many of these fifteen-cent magazines. They are a development of the last ten years. Their circulations are large and cover the whole of the North American continent, Canada as well as the United States; and even the figures of their circulation, enormous as they would seem to English publishers, cannot be taken as the full measure of their influence in popular education. The magazines are passed from family to family. They lie about in the social rooms of summer hotels and boarding-houses, in hotels in small towns, and in doctors' and dentists' waiting-rooms, for months, sometimes for two or three years, after the date of publication. They are, in fact, in service as long as the binding wire holds them together; and, as the political and economic articles have never been dull beyond the capacity of the most ordinary reader, their influence in popular political education is enormous.

The writers in these magazines dissected the wool and cotton and silk schedules of the Payne-Aldrich tariff, as the schedules of a protectionist tariff were never dissected before in the United States. The details were stripped of their technicalities, or the technicalities were clearly and simply explained. The writers showed to whom accrued the enormous largesse of the tariff; how small a proportion of it went to labour; and how the burden of it all was borne by the consumers. In this way there was brought about much of the popular revolt against the tariff of 1909 that expressed itself against the Republican party at the Congressional elections in November 1910.

From August 1909, when President Taft signed the Payne-Aldrich Act, the Republicans realised that the State and Congressional elections of 1910 would turn chiefly if not exclusively on the tariff. Their experience in 1890 when the McKinley tariff was enacted convinced them of that fact; and no member of the Republican party threw himself into the fight with more vigour than President Taft. The burden of justifying the Payne-Aldrich Act fell chiefly on Mr. Taft and Senator Lodge; for, as the elections drew near, Mr. Aldrich, whose term as Senator from Rhode Island expires in March 1911, announced that he was not a candidate for re-election.

Mr. Lodge's term as Senator also comes to an end in March next; but Mr. Lodge aspires to the leadership of the Senate thus vacated by Mr. Aldrich; and to secure re-election Mr. Lodge early threw himself into the conflict that was waged about the Payne-Aldrich tariff. Among stand-patters in the Senate Mr. Burrows, of Michigan, was the first to fall. In Michigan there are direct primaries for the nominations; and the Insurgent movement was so strong there that Mr. Burrows failed to secure the nomination, and was thus put out of the contest before the Michigan State Legislature, which will elect his successor at Washington, was chosen.

All the elections in Massachusetts between the enactment of the Payne-Aldrich tariff in 1909 and the beginning of the Congressional campaign in the autumn of 1910 made it obvious that the Republican party there was losing its hold. In the winter of 1909-10 the Republican candidate for Governor carried his election by a much reduced majority, and a few weeks later there was a by-election for Congress at which the Republicans lost a seat—one of three by-elections for Congress following the enactment of the tariff that were all adverse to the Republicans. Mr. Lodge, more than any other stand-patter of the House or the Senate, was a national figure in the

campaign of 1910. Much of the responsibility for the Payne-Aldrich Act, and in particular for the textile schedules, necessarily fell on him when Senator Aldrich had announced that he would not seek re-election in Rhode Island, and it was in this way that Mr. Taft and Mr. Lodge became so active and so prominent in the propaganda undertaken in defence of the last revision of the tariff.

Mr. Taft during his first year of office made no fewer than three hundred and forty-eight speeches—nearly all of them away from Washington. He made many more public addresses in his first year as President than even Mr. Roosevelt during his first year at the White House. He never lost an opportunity of defending the revision of the tariff. He even granted an interview to one of the writers of the fifteen-cent magazines, so eager was he to regain the ground in public confidence that he had obviously lost when he threw in his lot with the stand-patters in the extra session of Congress in 1909. It is not possible to summarise these utterances of Mr. Taft. It is not possible even to describe them. The fairest way to make clear his position on the tariff is to quote briefly from the open letter that he wrote for the Republican Congressional Campaign Book of 1910—for what in England would be described as the speaker's hand-book for use in the elections: for in this letter Mr. Taft reiterated much of what he had said on the platform in support of the Payne-Aldrich tariff between August 1909 and the opening of the Congressional campaign in October 1910.

‘Let us consider, summarily,’ he wrote, ‘the promises made and the legislation enacted by the present Congress: First and of primary importance was the promise to revise the tariff in accordance with the rule laid down in the platform, to wit: that the tariff on articles imported should be equal to the difference between their cost of production abroad and that cost in this country, including a reasonable profit for the domestic manufacturer. A very full investigation—full, at least, as such investigations have been conducted in the past—was made by the Ways and Means Committee of the House to determine what rates should be changed to conform to this rule. A reduction was made in 654 numbers, and an increase in some 220, while 1150 remained unchanged. The bill was amended in the Senate, but the proportion of increases to decreases was maintained. When I signed the bill, I accompanied my approval with the following memorandum:

“‘I have signed the Payne tariff bill because I believe it to be the result of a sincere effort on the part of the Republican party to make a downward revision, and to comply with the promises of the

platform as they have been generally understood, and as I interpreted them in the campaign before election.

“The bill is not a perfect tariff bill, or a complete compliance with the promises made strictly interpreted, but a fulfilment free from criticism in respect to a subject-matter involving many schedules and thousands of articles could not be expected. It suffices to say that except with regard to whiskey, liquors and wines, and in regard to silks and as to some high classes of cottons—all of which may be treated as luxuries and proper subjects of a revenue tariff—there have been very few increases in rates. There have been a great number of real decreases in rates, and they constitute a sufficient amount to justify the statement that this bill is a substantial downward revision, and a reduction of excessive rates. This is not a free-trade bill. It was not intended to be. The Republican party did not promise to make a free-trade bill. It promised to make the rates protective, but to reduce them when they exceeded the difference between the cost of production abroad and here, making allowance for the greater normal profit on active investments here. I believe that while this excess has not been reduced in a number of cases, in a great majority the rates are such as are necessary to protect American industries, but are low enough, in case of abnormal increase of demand, and raising of prices, to permit the possibility of the importation of the foreign article and thus to prevent excessive prices.

“The power granted to the Executive under the maximum and minimum clause may be exercised to secure the removal of obstacles which have been interposed by foreign Governments in the way of undue and unfair discrimination against American merchandise and products.

“The Philippine tariff section I have struggled to secure for ten years last past, and it gratifies me exceedingly by my signature to give it the effect of law. I am sure it will greatly increase the trade between the two countries, and it will do much to build up the Philippines in a healthful prosperity.

“The administrative clauses of the bill and the Customs Court are admirably adapted to secure a more uniform and a more speedy final construction of the meaning of the law.

“The authority to the President to use agents to assist him in the application of the maximum and minimum section of the statute, and to enable officials to administer the law, gives a wide latitude for the acquisition, under circumstances favourable to its truth, of information in respect to the price and cost of production of goods at home and abroad, which will throw much light on the operation of the present tariff and be of primary importance as officially collected data upon which future Executive action and Executive recommendations may be based.

“The corporation tax is a just and equitable excise measure, which it is hoped will produce a sufficient amount to prevent a deficit and which incidentally will secure valuable statistics and information

concerning the many corporations of the country, and will constitute an important step toward that degree of publicity and regulation which the tendency in corporate enterprises in the last twenty years has shown to be necessary."

'This fairly states the effect of the bill. The bill has been criticised for certain of its rates and schedules. Some of the criticisms are just and some are wide of the mark and most unjust. The truth is that under the old protective idea the only purpose was to make the tariff high enough to protect the home industry. The excess of the tariff over the difference in the cost of production here and abroad was not regarded as objectionable because it was supposed that competition between those who enjoyed the high protection would keep the price for the consumer down to what was reasonable for the manufacturer. The evil of excessive tariff rates, however, showed itself in the temptation of manufacturers to combine and suppress competition, and then to maintain the prices so as to take advantage of the excess of the tariff rate over the difference between the cost of production abroad and here.

'The Payne tariff bill is the first bill passed by the Republican party in which the necessity for reducing rates to avoid this evil has been recognised, and it is therefore a decided step in the right direction and it ought to be accepted as such. On the whole, it was a downward revision particularly on articles of necessity and on raw materials. The actual figures on the first year's operation of the law demonstrate this. It must also be remembered that the tariff rates in the new law on imported liquors, wines, and silks were increased substantially over the Dingley rates, because these were luxuries and it was intended to increase the revenue.

'The charge that the present tariff is responsible for the increase in the prices of necessities is demonstrably false, because the high prices, with very few exceptions, affect articles in the tariff upon which there was no increase in rates or in respect to which there was a substantial reduction.'

In his letter, dated Beverley, Massachusetts, August 20, 1910, Mr. Taft also explained his policy with regard to the new Tariff Commission :

'a Commission of disinterested persons who will ascertain the facts, not in a formal hearing by examination and cross-examination of witnesses, but by the kind of investigation that statisticians and scientific investigators use.' 'When the Commission completes its work,' he continued, 'either on the entire tariff, or on any of the schedules in respect to which issue has arisen, and the work of the Commission shows that the present tariff is wrong and should be changed, I expect to bring the matter to the attention of Congress, with a view to the amendment of the tariff in that particular. Of course this will be impracticable unless Congress itself shall adopt the parliamentary rule, as I hope it will, that a bill to amend one

schedule of the tariff may not be subject to the motion to amend by adding changes in other schedules. It will thus be possible to take up a single schedule with respect to which it is probable that a great majority of each House will be unprejudiced, to admit the evidence and so reach a fair conclusion, and this method will tend to avoid disturbing business conditions.'

Finally Mr. Taft, in returning to the defence of the new tariff, emphasised the fact that it was bringing in a large revenue.

'It has,' he wrote, 'by its revenue-producing capacity, turned a deficit in the ordinary operations of the Government of \$58,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1909, to a surplus in the first full year of the law ending August 5, 1910. From a revenue standpoint there can be no controversy over the effectiveness of the new law. Increased revenue indicates increased imports, and an examination of our imports during the past year will disclose a most substantial increase in manufacturers' material, from which, in the making of finished products, whether for exportation or for home consumption, has come a larger volume of employment for our wage-earners, a larger purchasing power, and a greater consumption of the products of our farms and fabrications of our factories. So far then as such importations do not displace home production, they must be of benefit to all.'

Mr. Lodge, in his defence of the Payne-Aldrich tariff, was active on a committee of the Senate which issued a report to show that the tariff of 1909 was not responsible for high prices. Mr. Lodge also caused to be issued as a Senate document Mr. J. Ellis Barker's '101 Points against Free Trade,' a publication borrowed from the literature of the protectionist propaganda in England; and in his campaign for re-election in Massachusetts—perhaps the hardest campaign a New England Republican Senator ever had to make for re-election—he devoted some attention to the textile schedules.

The Democratic candidate for Governor in Massachusetts, Mr. Eugene Foss, was the successful candidate in the by-election for Congress in the winter of 1909-10, when the Republicans lost the seat. Mr. Foss, in the elections in November 1910, as at the by-election, vigorously attacked the textile schedules and the part that Senator Lodge had had in the enactment of these and the other protectionist schedules in the tariff.

'Mr. Foss asked me last night,' said Mr. Lodge, at Gloucester, Massachusetts, on November 2, 'a series of questions as to the woollen schedule, and one answer will cover all the questions. My colleague Senator Crane and I, and a great majority of the Republicans in the Senate, voted against any amendment to the woollen

schedule, because if that schedule had been opened to amendment the bill would have been defeated. The Senators from the wool-growing States would have joined with the Democrats and defeated the bill if their industry had been attacked. I thought, with many other things, that the woollen schedule should be modified and improved, but when it was a question of defeating the whole bill, my colleague and I, and most of the Republicans in the Senate, were not willing to lose the bill for the sake of trying to amend one schedule. If we had tried to amend the woollen schedule we should have been left with the entire Dingley law, including the woollen schedule, just as it was.'

Mr. Roosevelt was not in the United States when Congress passed the Payne-Aldrich Act. He did not come into the controversy until well on in the summer of 1910. At Sioux Falls, on September 3, he made a speech in which he dealt with the tariff as a moral issue.

'What we want,' Mr. Roosevelt then said, 'is a square deal in the tariff as in everything else; a square deal for the wage-earner; a square deal for the employer; and a square deal for the general public. To obtain it we must have a thoroughly efficient and well-equipped tariff commission. The tariff ought to be a material issue and not a moral issue, but if instead of a square deal we get a crooked deal, then it becomes emphatically a moral issue. What we desire in a tariff is such a measure of protection as will equalise the cost of production here and abroad, and as the cost of production is mainly labour cost, this means primarily a tariff sufficient to make up for the difference in labour cost here and abroad. The American public wants the American labouring man put on an equality with other citizens, so that he shall have the ability to achieve the American standard of living, and the capacity to enjoy it, and to do this we must see that his wages are not lowered by improper competition with inferior wage-workers abroad—with wage-workers who are paid poorly and who live as no Americans are willing to live. But the American public does not wish to see the tariff so arranged as to benefit primarily a few wealthy men.'

In New York, in the contest over the tariff in his own State, Mr. Roosevelt was a party to the adoption by the Republican Convention of a resolution in the State platform which commended the revision of 1909, and eulogised the Payne-Aldrich tariff because its average rate of duty was less than that of the Wilson-Gorman Act of 1894, and 'unlike the Democratic law 'its great reductions of duty have not stopped industry, nor 'deprived labour of any part of its hire.' In the hotly waged contest over the tariff in Massachusetts Mr. Roosevelt sided with Senator Lodge and the Republican stand-patters who in

that State were supporting Mr. Lodge. In a word, Mr. Roosevelt quite failed to realise that the tariff issue in the elections of 1910 had progressed far beyond the stage where platitudes were of service; and his influence in the elections so far as the tariff issue was concerned was of no traceable value to either party to the controversy.

In the ordinary course of procedure it will be December 1911 before the Congress elected last November can begin its work; for with a Republican President there is no likelihood that a Congress in which the Democrats have a majority of sixty-three in the House of Representatives will be convened in extra session. Eight stand-pat Republican Senators will come to the end of their terms in March 1911, and cannot hope for re-election, as Democratic majorities are now in control of the Legislatures in their States. Senator Lodge's is the only seat yet in doubt. On a joint ballot of the two Houses of the Massachusetts Legislature, the Republicans will have a majority of twenty-seven or twenty-eight. But there is some insurgency in Massachusetts. If it develops in the State Legislature there may be a dead-lock, and to end this, and to ensure that the seat will go to a Republican, it may be that a Republican other than Senator Lodge must be nominated.

Should Mr. Lodge or another Republican be elected from Massachusetts, the only loss in the Senate that the Republican party will suffer from the overturn in the New England States will be a Senator from Maine, which for the first time for thirty years elected a Democratic Governor and a Democratic Legislature. In Massachusetts and Connecticut Democratic Governors were elected, but not Democratic State Legislatures. The Democrats also carried several Congressional districts in New England, and the overturn generally was remarkable from the fact that the popular vote was strongest against the Republicans in those urban areas in which the woollen, cotton, and silk industries are established—the industries to which the highest protection is afforded by the Tariff Act of 1909. There was a time when Democratic successes in the New England States would have been regarded as indeed remarkable, but in recent years at most centres of industry in the United States it has come to be popularly realised that high protection has but little to do with wages, and this is particularly so as regards the industries in which newly arrived immigrants from Continental Europe are found on the pay rolls in the largest numbers.

ART. III.—THE STATE AND THE FREEDOM OF ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES.

1. *Board of Education. Reports from those Universities and University Colleges in Great Britain which participated in the Parliamentary Grant for University Colleges in the year 1908-9.* [Cd. 5246.] 1910.
2. *Royal Commission on University Education in London. Appendix to First Report of the Commissioners. Minutes of Evidence, July 1909—April 1910. With Appendices and Index.* [Cd. 5166.] 1910.

It will scarcely be denied by any competent observer that University education in England is passing through a period of crisis. The agitations of labour and politics, which admonish us of the approach of a time when both the forms of government and the structure of society will be subjected to searching examination, have their counterpart in the unsettlement which characterises the domain of Universities. The questions which press themselves upon their attention touch the first principles of organisation, policy, and aim. What is the true function of Universities in a modern State? How many are required? How are they to train 'the thinking power of the nation?' What kind of education is to distinguish them? What is to be the relation of Universities to one another, and their relation to the State? The urgency of these questions may not everywhere be fully recognised, but already opinion is busy with them, and it is only needful to glance at the attitude of Universities towards them in order to realise the prevalence of restlessness and uncertainty. Oxford and Cambridge, aroused by criticism from without and by hopes and fears from within, are absorbed in the arduous enterprise of self-reformation. The University of London, the victim of a complication of maladies, has submitted itself to that surgery of State which Oxford and Cambridge agree to dread; and a Royal Commission is now engaged in the probings which precede the operating-table and the knife. The other Universities—Durham, Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Sheffield, Birmingham, and Bristol—present a composite picture in which progress and poverty are the prevailing hues, and diversity of principle the characteristic of design. Of late origin—five of them having received their charters during the reign of King Edward VII.—they owe their rise to a coincidence of forces and opportunities significant of the modern time. The public have

not yet grasped the full scope of the achievement. Not since the monastic revival of the twelfth century, or the scholastic revolution of the sixteenth, has England known an educational movement so rich in romance, in courage, in devotion, and in promise. The dreamer has dreamed, the founder has given land and gold, the public have subscribed, civic pride has been stirred, and the cry and need for knowledge have justified them all.

Yet these Universities, and the three institutions at Nottingham, Reading, and Southampton which remain University Colleges, have as yet done little more than vindicate their title to exist. They have hitherto devoted most of their efforts to the task of proving themselves necessary to the community, and worthy of private and public support. It has thus been inevitable perhaps that the record of their progress should often remind the observer of the rise of the big emporium whose swelling volume of business asserts itself in a rapid succession of new counters and departments. There would seem to be a risk of forgetting that statistics of profit and bulk, though useful tests of trade, are not conclusive tests of Universities; and it is worth remarking that the time is surely approaching when these institutions must revert to first principles, and study how to justify in reference to more exalted standards the great name which they have assumed. For the idea of a University reaches far beyond a varied supply of professional training, the prodigal granting of degrees, the anxious encouragement of research, and the politic performance of educational contracts. Extend the catalogue of such activities as far as we please, we shall discover in the end that a University is something more than an engine of utility, or a product of organisation. The essence of a University is a spirit, a principle of life and energy, an influence. And that influence must be impoverished and robbed of efficacy if, owing to want of means, or want of ideas, or want of freedom, a University falls short of the great end of its being, that of caring for the spirit and mind of man, regardless of considerations of utility. The pursuit of this high aim distinguishes a University from every other kind of educational institution, however meritorious; and more and more the new Universities are disquieted to realise that they are destined to pursue this aim in vain unless they can win for themselves an ample endowment of freedom and power.

It is proposed in the present essay to apply to the Universities, more particularly to those of recent origin, a single test, the test of freedom. How far can we affirm that our Universities possess the character of independence, and how far are they in danger of becoming in reality, though not in name, departments of the

State? There is probably no question which raises issues of deeper import to their welfare, and at no previous time could such an inquiry have been made more pertinently than now. For, on the one hand, the new Universities, or most of them, have struggled through the stage of their weakness and immaturity and are preparing for a wider career; and, on the other hand, their dependence in large measure upon State aid and upon the continued performance of educational service agreeably to State requirements, brings forcibly to their attention the problem of State control. The new Universities have come to strength only to find that during the years of their growth the State has developed with astonishing rapidity an organ of centralised administration able, and perhaps not unwilling, to include them within its jurisdiction. Beyond question, the Board of Education has become a tremendous power in English education of all kinds. Few who have observed the ceaseless expansion of its authority and influence in the last few years will be disposed to minimise the risk which will be run by Universities until their independence is protected not simply by an accidental and perhaps temporary dispersion of administrative responsibility in regard to them, and by a loose understanding limited to a special aspect of the question, but by statutory guarantees. There is indeed no time to be lost. Not only is every University in England concerned with the task of finding a right solution to this problem, but the avoidance of its dangerous possibilities concerns the statesman and the administrator no less than the University pioneer and founder. Nay, if intellectual vigour has any bearing upon national welfare and efficiency, if intellectual vigour is in any degree dependent upon a wise policy in national education, then every citizen must anxiously desire that the Universities should be saved from intellectual subjection and sterility, and again that their relationship with the State should escape the misfortune of anarchy and confusion.

I.

The problem under discussion is clearly raised in a passage of peculiar interest which appears in the recently published Minutes of Evidence [Cd. 5166] taken before the Royal Commission on University Education in London. The subject of discussion was the expediency of instituting a State degree examination, and the witness giving evidence was Mr. Sidney Webb.

487. *Sir Robert Morant*.—One can see some of the difficulties. It suggests a vista of all sorts of possibilities of State control of thought, and State control of I do not know what: if the Government diploma came to be very valuable, a very fine thing to have, to gain as a University degree, then that would be putting in the hands of the State a most appalling power of controlling thought, would it not?

Witness.—But after all the State is not anybody but ourselves, and if the Government were assisted by a Consultative Committee, representing the Universities, and if you like, representing the House of Commons, I do not see why we should object to give ourselves corporately any power that is desirable.

Sir Robert Morant.—That is just the point.

488. *Mr. M'Cormick*.—We would take care it was not too much in the hands of officials?

Witness.—But I never object to the tramcar that I go home in being in the hands of officials.

Sir Robert Morant.—I wanted to suggest that that was just the point. Education is different from providing trams, and there might be a serious danger from controlling the development of education, which is, after all, the development of thought and so on, getting into the hands of a Central Body; a disadvantage might be through control of Parliament, or the control of officials. Either would be equally bad. (P. 37.)

Readers of Stevenson's 'Wrecker' will remember that Captain Wicks, of the *Currency Lass*, when discussing the means of obliterating traces of murder, was led unexpectedly 'to sound 'unwonted depths of art criticism.' Similarly the subordinate topic of a State degree provokes here a clash of principle around a problem of far greater moment—namely, the relationship of Universities to the State. No sooner does the Chairman of the London School of Economics and Political Science hazard what may be termed the tramcar view of this relationship, than he is answered from the opposite quarter of the heavens by the ultramontane thunder of the Permanent Secretary of the Board of Education. Mr. Webb pictures the State as our harmless selves masquerading under an *alias*; to Sir Robert Morant's vision the State presents itself as a Central Body with hands of prey. Mr. Webb thinks that officials can manage anything; Sir Robert Morant draws the line at education, 'which is, after 'all, the development of thought.' Here, indeed, are incompatibilities between which yawns the vast abyss. Here, surely, it will become us to remember Bacon's precept, not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider. Which of these champions are we to trust? Is University

education really a problem of the same order as urban locomotion, or must it be treated differently because it happens to have more to do with thought? Let no one dismiss such inquiries as trivial. Already the Universities transact business with the State. Already they jolt along a road of compromise, which may as well lead them to a tramway dépôt as to any other reposeful compound. Already the State concerns itself with Universities, and it is likely that even now there are administrators hardy enough to contemplate without wincing those vistas of controlled thought which appal Sir Robert Morant.

Let us glance at the relationship now existing between the Universities and the State. The Universities of England are commonly thought of as the old and the new. Oxford and Cambridge dwell apart, securely founded upon the rock of their historic predominance. They exhibit all the insignia of authority and independence. Parliament is indeed ultimately their master; but Parliament, which delights to trace one of the main sources of its wisdom to the groves of these venerated academies, is slow to visit with correction institutions so rooted in national esteem, and in origin coeval with itself. We may say of our ancient Universities what Burke said of the English Colonies in America, 'that in general they owe little or nothing to any care of ours; and that they are not squeezed into this happy form by the constraints of watchful and suspicious government, but that through a wise and salutary neglect a generous nature has been suffered to take her own way to perfection.' It must be admitted that the freedom of Oxford and Cambridge, particularly in the vexed sphere of religious belief, has undergone during the ages many arbitrary contractions and enlargements; but it would be misleading to characterise indiscriminately such instances of State intervention as coercive, while it remains undeniable that within wide limits these Universities have been suffered to choose and pursue their own policy without let or hindrance from Parliament. In the last century, indeed, Parliament interfered more than once, and with decisive results; but reform having been effected, the hand of the State was withdrawn. The Crown, it may be objected, controls the appointments to some of the chief University dignities and offices; but in this country University Professors are not supposed to repay patronage by political services. Oxford and Cambridge are free in essentials. Their ordinary policy, except in so far as it may be affected by the terms of endowments, or by public criticism, or by the rare exercise of parliamentary authority, is their own. It is

not imposed upon them from without, nor is their progress regulated by the flicks and cuts of a driver's whip. If Oxford retains compulsory Greek, if Cambridge abolishes the Senior Wrangler, and if both Universities resist for more than a generation the admission of women to their degrees, these courses are not taken to propitiate Parliament, or Boards of Education, or Education Committees, or Advisory Committees of the Treasury. They are taken in accordance with the judgement and the will of Oxford and Cambridge. And, therefore, the energy of these Universities is not expended in courting or repelling educational authorities. They move freely along the path of their own choice. They do not depend upon public money, and therefore they are not amenable to the inspectors and regulations of the State. It may be that this freedom of action and this competence of means bring with them peculiar perils, that to these causes Oxford owes her 'century of inactivity,' and Cambridge her bygone reproach as 'a peaceful scene of slumber and thoughtless 'meditation.' And yet if we were to inquire why Oxford and Cambridge have been and are still not only seats of learning but founts of inspiration, why their genius never fails to quicken and enthral successive generations of youth, why their spirit, constantly renewed, passes forth to inform so much of our public life, our statesmanship, our religion, our laws, our science, and our literature, there would be no mystery about the answer. The answer would be that these renowned Universities have enjoyed for centuries the freedom necessary to the dignity of thought, to the unfolding of their characters, and to the growth of deep and rich personality. Their discipline, their schools, their traditions, their standards are the expression of that freedom; and it may be that the latest of their services to the nation will be to uphold amid an inundation of mean expediences the ideal of the free University.

When, however, we turn to the new Universities—London, Durham, Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Sheffield, Birmingham, and Bristol—and observe them from the same standpoint, we must return another verdict. For there are two special circumstances which must be taken into account if we would understand how these new Universities have come to be what they are. In the first place, they owe much—some of them naturally more than others—to the fact that from a very early stage, in some cases from the beginning, they have been able to do business with the State. And, secondly, they owe no less to the fact that for twenty years the State has been promoting University teaching and research by special

grants of money. It will repay us to scrutinise these two circumstances.

To speak of the new Universities as State-made would be incorrect. 'Central Bodies,' of the kind which Sir Robert Morant mistrusts, seldom initiate the educational activities which they inspect, and the new Universities rightly glory in the fact that they are home-made. And yet if they may not salute the State with the title of mother, if even that of nurse credits her with a solicitude at once too tender and too prophetic, they must at least pay their tribute of respectful gratitude to the State as friendly employer and cautious patron. The State accepts the responsibilities of employer when, acting through one of the administrative departments, it proposes conditions for the performance by approved institutions of certain educational services. Such services may include, for example, the training of teachers, the training of doctors, or the provision of agricultural or other kinds of technical instruction. Those institutions which agree to provide these services must abide by the terms of the contract. The analogy with a building contract may not run all the way, but it runs most of it. For payment read grants; for specifications read regulations; for Clerk of the Works read his Majesty's Inspectors. There is, however, one difference, and it is radical. The builder's job is finite. The day comes when the last stone is laid and the last nail driven, and then the obligations of that contract fetter him no more. He resumes his freedom. But those who engage themselves to provide educational service for the State accept not a job but a destiny. For the work is never finished, and because it is never finished, it becomes one of those irremovable factors which control policy. The employer naturally has his own ideas of the work to be done, of the result to be recorded. Experience enables him to replace what was tentative and vague in his early precepts by more confident and precise instructions. He becomes an exponent of the aims and methods of teaching, and of the general notions which inspire policy. His view is likely to prevail, for three potent persuaders, the purse, the law, and time, are upon his side. If the gentle dropping of hints should fail to wear away the obstinacy of those who may be dependent upon his good will, he can have recourse to the method of constriction—the slow pressure of annual coil upon coil of regulations and routine. And in the last resort administration can be 'gingered.' It thus happens that whereas Oxford alone is answerable for her Pass B.A.s, the trained teacher-graduate of Birmingham or Sheffield is an article finished locally according to specifications from the

metropolis, and bearing the indelible signature of the Board of Education.

State patronage of English Universities and University Colleges dates from 1889-90. It takes the form of annual grants-in-aid administered by the Treasury. These grants are given not for services rendered but for the promotion of teaching and research of University standard. No institution can qualify for a grant without satisfying the Treasury in respect of severe tests. The total sum distributed in 1889-90 was £15,000. In 1897 the sum was raised to £25,000, and in 1902 to £27,000. In 1904 Mr. Austen Chamberlain, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, with courageous perception of the educational needs of the country, doubled this sum, and in 1905 he raised it further to £100,000. This sum is distributed in annual fixed grants, ranging from £12,000 to £500, among fourteen Universities and Colleges, and in annual variable grants, much smaller in amount, to the same institutions for special purposes. It should also be mentioned that £8000 is annually granted to London University as a contribution to the costs of general administration, and £2000 is similarly granted to each of the six Universities at Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, and Sheffield. Altogether in 1909-10 the Treasury disbursed among the new English Universities and Colleges a sum of £116,600.* In November 1910 the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd George) announced that he was prepared to increase the total annual grant to the English Universities and Colleges by £50,000.

State contributions are also given to the Universities and Colleges of Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. These grants are upon a more liberal scale. For example, the State grant for the current year to the University of Wales and its three constituent Colleges amounts to £31,000. In comparison with the sums voted for like purposes by foreign Governments, or by British Governments beyond the seas, the contribution of the English Government to English University education is insignificant.

* Universities' Bluebook, [Cd. 5246], 1910, pp. xviii-xix, Appendix B. The special grant of £2000 to Bristol University begins in 1910-11. In reply to a question in the House of Commons in November 1910, the Financial Secretary to the Treasury stated that 'the Treasury grant which will be paid (on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee) to Universities and University Colleges in England in 1910-11 will not exceed £101,250. In addition, there will be paid to Universities, but not on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, £22,000.'

notwithstanding the recent increase. The single University of Toronto, for example, receives a State grant nearly equivalent to that which in England was doled out in 1909-10 among fourteen Universities and University Colleges.

Let us now reduce generalities to terms of cash, and demonstrate with precision the extent to which the new English Universities and Colleges are dependent upon the State as employer and patron. The following statistics are extracted from Appendix A, No. 1 (pp. xiv-xv), in the Bluebook [Cd. 5246] issued in July 1910 by the Board of Education, and containing the annual reports from the Universities and Colleges in receipt of grants. The figures relate to the year 1908-9.

GRANTS FROM EXCHEQUER

TOTAL INCOME (ALL SOURCES)	Treasury	Training of Teachers	Other Grants from Board of Education	Grants from other Govern- ment Depts.	Total from Exchequer	Percen- tage of total Income	
£	£	£	£	£	£		
Birmingham. . .	54,362	11,900	3,170	—	15,070	27·7	
Bristol . . .	14,946	4,700	—	118	4,918	33·0	
Leeds . . .	56,563	10,900	1,742	1,525	15,167	26·8	
Liverpool . . .	72,599	12,950	2,209	773	16,132	22·2	
Manchester . . .	80,124	15,000	3,246	788	19,034	23·7	
Sheffield . . .	41,010	7,700	720	3,085	11,505	28·1	
London (Univ. Coll.)	55,867	10,950	—	—	300	11,250	20·1
King's Coll. . .	49,394	8,600	631	343	130	9,704	19·6
Bedford Coll. School of	17,097	4,700	244	—	—	4,944	28·9
Economics . .	12,893	1,150	—	—	1,930	3,080	23·9
Newcastle . .	28,680	6,700	2,597	954	1,744	11,996	41·8
Nottingham. .	20,779	5,700	1,950	678	—	8,328	40·1
Reading . . .	20,379	3,900	1,463	749	1,000	7,112	35·0
Southampton .	12,150	2,250	1,924	591	—	4,765	39·2
TOTALS . . .	536,843	107,100	19,896	9,604	6,404	143,005	26·6

In the introductory report, prefixed to the volume, it is stated (p. xi) that 'the actual total income of the English Universities and University Colleges under review exceeds half a million, some 26 per cent. of which comes from the Exchequer, and some 16 per cent. from Local Education Authorities, while 32 per cent. is in the nature of fees of students, and nearly 15 per cent. arises from endowments.' It is probable that when the promised increase of the Treasury grant by £50,000 has taken effect, the proportion of Exchequer contributions in relation to the total income of each institution will be somewhat larger.

II.

The practical man, that petted dogmatist of the age, if faced with the problem of relationship suggested by the foregoing recital, is likely to take a short way with it. Summoning proverbial philosophy to his aid, he will remind us that he who pays the piper calls the tune, and that if the Universities cannot tolerate the State music they must pay the piper themselves. Not even the brigaded intellect of eight Universities, he will continue, can compass the feat of eating a pudding and having it too. The Universities, in short, cannot have it both ways. If they consent to do State work for pay, they cannot help becoming State servants. If they become pensioners upon the State's bounty, they cannot claim the privileges of independence.

Nevertheless, though policy often exemplifies truisms, truisms, even when they hail from the market-place, are less often a guide to policy. If the question really were one of common bargaining, we might capitulate to the dogmatism of the business man. But it is nothing of the kind. 'Education,' as Sir Robert Morant so well said, 'is different from providing 'trams'; and University education in particular not only differs from the provision of public conveyances, but, as the present Minister for Education has lately pointed out, it differs also from those other branches of education subordinate to itself. Unless we grasp the fact of this difference, and its consequences, we shall make no progress towards a solution. An administrative system, for instance, which applied the same methods and brought the same spirit to the treatment of problems essentially different might enjoy the glow of vigorous exercise, but in the long run its efforts would be likely to prove as disappointing as those of a physician who treated all maladies with the same drug. There is a risk lest having called into being a number of Universities, we should proceed to treat them as if they were something else.

The present argument endeavours to show that no policy towards the Universities can be trusted unless it rests upon three propositions of demonstrable validity. The first is that the Universities and Colleges can no more dispense with the co-operation of the State than the State can dispense with theirs. Withdraw the co-operation of the State, and these institutions must stop valuable work, lose many of their best students, and be deprived of about one-fourth of their revenue. It hardly requires an intimate knowledge

of the internal economy of a University or College to appreciate the effects of such a blow. A University, as Cardinal Newman has told us, 'is not a foundry, or 'a mint,' one part of which can be destroyed without detriment to the others. Rather, a University is an 'Alma Mater, knowing her children one by one,' a living society whose being is organically one, so that if a limb be cut off the rest of the body may bleed to death. Not long ago, for example, the University of Manchester, the strongest and wealthiest of these corporations, was compelled to take vigorous steps in order to prevent the injury which must have resulted had the comparatively small sum of £2000 a year been withdrawn from it, for administrative reasons, by the Treasury. The truth is that the Universities and Colleges have had and still have a hard and anxious struggle to pay their way, and assuredly they cannot afford to imperil the advantages of co-operation with the State. On the other hand, the State and the nation more and more look to them to make good what is perhaps, by comparison with other countries, the weakest spot in our educational armament. There are many ways in which the new Universities benefit the people. They are centres of liberal culture, diffusing influence among populations immersed in the toil of business or industry. They are in a peculiar degree the Universities of the poor and less prosperous. They treat women no less liberally than men. These are great services. But their distinctive service, the service which commends them to the statesman and gives them, from the point of view of utility, a strong position in any scheme of national education, is that they are fitted to give under liberal conditions that specialised scientific and technical training which, as Germany and America so well understand, is necessary to modern industrial and commercial efficiency. There is not one of these institutions which does not associate with the older studies, the humanities, instruction and training in applied sciences. In April 1909 the Prince of Wales, now his Majesty the King, pointed out, when opening new buildings at Sheffield University, that 'during the latter part of the nineteenth century our important 'industrial centres recognised that there were problems to 'be solved differing widely from those dealt with in the more 'ancient Universities'; and in the same year he declared at the University College at Cardiff that 'we must look ahead 'and endeavour to be ready to meet all the requirements of 'scientific and intellectual progress. The imperative necessity 'for higher education and research is becoming more and more

‘recognised.’ The King’s words must be endorsed by every far-seeing statesman, every educational authority, and every reflecting citizen. A modern nation must command trained intelligence for the conflicts of peace as well as for those of war. If there is any scandal about the State and the new Universities, it is not that the State has been too forward in its advances but rather that it has been too coy.

The second proposition is that freedom is the life-blood of a University. For what is a University? Most men would perhaps face with a more tranquil courage the task of defining a Dreadnought, which baffles the ‘Times,’ or that of defining the duties of an archdeacon, which once baffled the House of Lords. We may hold with Cardinal Newman that the true function of a University is to impart liberal culture, or with Huxley that a University should be a factory of new knowledge. But whatever our idea of a University may be, ‘whatever theory of University education we adopt, whether we hold that it should aim at a complete training of the faculties, or that it should prepare the student for the pursuits of later life,’* we shall no more conceive of a University in chains than we shall conceive of a Dreadnought climbing the Himalayas. Nature is opposed to it. ‘The very name of University,’ says Newman, in his immortal treatise,† speaking of the range of its teaching, ‘is inconsistent with restrictions of any kind.’ A University may be large or small, rich or poor, old or new; but a University which is not free sails under false colours. ‘Academical institutions,’ says Newman again, ‘are living and energising bodies, if they deserve the name of University at all.’‡ In this country, at least, there is no organised intellectual unit higher or more comprehensive than a University. ‘What an Empire is in political history, such is a University in the sphere of philosophy and research. It is the high protecting power of all knowledge and science, of fact and principle, of inquiry and discovery, of experiment and speculation.’§ These are high claims, but ‘education is a high word’|| and ‘among the objects of human enterprise, none higher or nobler can be named than that which is contemplated in the erection of a University.’¶ A University must be free to govern itself; free to receive or reject proposals made to it; free to develope and control its schools and its

* Seeley, ‘Liberal Education in Universities’ (1867).

† Idea of a University, p. 20.

‡ Ibid. p. 216.

§ p. 459.

|| p. 144.

¶ p. 457.

discipline ; free to cherish and express its own faith, purpose, and ideas in the stronghold of its home. It may co-operate ; but, without betrayal of trust, it must not abdicate. It cannot barter away the immediate jewel of its soul. If it is not to be suffered 'to take its own way to perfection,' to pursue of its own will and motion the great University ideals, it ought never to have been chartered by the Crown. Parliament, indeed, is above 'all persons and causes' ; but Parliament, having sanctioned the creation of Universities, can have no object or desire except that Universities may fulfil themselves in the best possible way. If freedom is the life-blood of a University, if a sacrifice which compromises freedom can be shown to be a mortal blow, then Parliament would be unlikely to favour an administrative policy which, let us suppose, should harass Universities with restrictions, and try to squeeze them into conformity with an official pattern. The danger may seem fanciful ; but administration, even when it is well-intentioned, is under temptation to mistake uniformity for symmetry. Uniformity means the repetition of a pattern and is the opposite of variety. But that 'goodly and graceful 'symmetry' which 'commends the whole pile and structure' is the outcome of 'many moderate varieties and brotherly 'dissimilitudes that are not vastly disproportional.' Milton's imagery gives us in embryo the ideal of a symmetrical scheme of English Universities, and it is at once apparent that without liberal freedom of self-developement for each the ideal is irrelevant. Let us not be seduced from the true principles which alone can guide us by any quotation of precedents from France, Germany, or the United States. Such precedents, in so far as they would advise us to jeopardise or diminish freedom, are recorded for our warning. In devising a policy for national institutions, our first duty, as Disraeli told us, is always 'to 'consult the genius of the people.' The genius of the English people, in spite of the onward rush of bureaucracy, is not yet subjugated into preferring bureaucratic decrees to independent initiative. It is possible to seize able Englishmen by force, thrust them into a narrow alley between high walls, and compel them to carry a heavy burden along it until they drop. But the testimony of a self-governing empire exists to prove that far more and better work will be got out of them if they are treated as responsible creatures. The Universities in claiming freedom are only claiming the English birthright. It is reassuring to find that the present Minister for Education and the present Chancellor of the Exchequer are in accord with the general principle here advanced. In answer to a

deputation from London University in July 1910, which pleaded for a simplification of the conditions attached to Board of Education grants, Mr. Runciman expressed his belief 'that grants to Universities should be administered with a degree of independence different from that which obtained in the case of other educational institutions.' He added that 'he realised the importance of giving to Universities and University Colleges a considerable amount of freedom in instruction.*' And in November 1910 Mr. Lloyd George expressed his concurrence with the view advanced by a Committee representative of the English Universities and Colleges, that while 'the fullest expert inspection' of the work of the institutions receiving State aid would be welcomed, it was 'essential for them to have complete freedom as to the mode of expenditure of grants.'

The welcome words of these Ministers inspire confidence that our third proposition will be given the mild reception of a platitude. It is that the exercise by the State of administrative vigilance is quite consistent with the admission of the propositions that the Universities and Colleges cannot afford to dispense with the co-operation and help of the State, that the State in turn depends upon them as allies in its great enterprise of national education, and that the proper freedom of Universities should be preserved in its integrity. The administrative exigency must not be overlooked. Nothing is gained by questioning or minimising the fact that the State is the guardian of the taxpayers' interests. Put the case for University autonomy as high as we please, we beat the air if we argue that the State can fling public money to these institutions without asking and ascertaining what becomes of it. Government would compromise its honour if it demanded less, and the Universities would only stir up ridicule if they pretended to be exempt from human frailty. When, therefore, a University accepts State grants it concedes to the State the right of access to its books and accounts. It cannot demur if the State should require that the return of annual receipts and expenditure should be presented in a particular way, nor if the State should insist that, apart from minor reservations, the facts should be published for the information of Parliament and the public. The expedient of publishing the returns from the several institutions according to a common schedule was adopted in the Universities' Bluebook for 1910. Its adoption, which has greatly facilitated comparative study,

* *Times* Report, July 20, 1910.

was the outcome of a frank and friendly conference between the officers of the Board of Education concerned and representatives of the Universities and Colleges. The precedent is of the highest value, for it contains a principle of policy admitting of wide and beneficial extension. Such a method of procedure is not merely the path of least resistance; it is often the only open road of progress. Administration, left to itself, is apt to worship at the shrine of 'thorough' only to discover at a late stage that instead of kindling alacrity and homage in the breasts of the administered, it has paralysed their faculties of response.

Debateable ground begins when we pass from the question of finance to that of general inspection and control. Agreement, however, may still take us some way. As long as the State pays for the doing of specified work, as long as it aids Universities by subsidy, it can reasonably claim privileges of partnership. It has a right to know how things are going, and how promises are kept. In regard to the specified work it has a right to go further, and to claim a voice, sometimes perhaps a deciding voice, in the consultations which should determine the general line of procedure. Nor can any argument take from the State its reserved power of asserting its will in regard to certain fundamental points of efficiency through the sanction of the withdrawal of its support. There is here a broad realm of authority and opportunity. Yet power is known, and is popular or the reverse, not through the definition of its bounds, but through the spirit and quality of its acts.

The general reader would hardly be interested in an attempt to test the quality of the present administration of education by the detailed study of an example. Nevertheless, a point of capital importance to the present argument emerges if we reflect for a moment upon the methods adopted by the Board of Education in regard to the training of teachers. In 1908-9 there were 2017 students who were being educated and trained at thirteen English University institutions* with the object of becoming teachers in elementary schools. The State contributed £41,718 towards the cost of their education and maintenance,† the control over the work being vested in the Board

* Namely. the Universities of Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, and Sheffield; University College, London, King's College, and Bedford College; and the University Colleges of Reading, Nottingham, Newcastle, and Southampton.

† Universities' Bluebook, 1910, pp. xviii-xix, Appendix B. The amount of grant accruing to the institutions as revenue available

of Education. The Board exercise their control through regulations, inspections, correspondence, and routine. To do justice to this great department of work would require a special article. We must content ourselves here with two observations. No person of experience would hesitate to acknowledge the remarkable ability and thoroughness of the Board's supervision. That which is done, alike in principle and detail, even when it clashes with the convenience or desires of the institutions concerned, is done in obedience to much experience, to a real sense of responsibility, and with enlightened views and the best intentions. Yet precisely for this reason it is necessary to regard the problem from a point of view different but not hostile, and perfectly legitimate. It is not ability which must be challenged, but the system, and the principle upon which it rests. How far, for example, does this system cultivate initiative in the Colleges? It may be said comprehensively that nothing can be done in regard to these students in training without the leave of the Board. If any doubt is entertained upon the point, a glance at the current Regulations will extinguish it, and at the same time it will kindle compassion for those, whether teachers or taught, who are condemned to stumble along a path not of their own choosing through this extensive jungle of rules, conditions, and menacing alternatives. The Regulations for 1910-11 are published in a pamphlet of 122 pages. They are 80 in number, are arranged in thirteen chapters, and are sandwiched between sixteen pages of prefatory memorandum and 54 pages of appendices. The Board supervise the admission of the students, their numbers, their religious freedom, their conduct, their health, their studies, their diet, their fees, their lodging, their instructors, and their examiners. In the preface to the Regulations the Board expatiate on the nature of the educational enterprise in hand, and on the ideals which should be pursued by the institutions engaged in the training of teachers. Under such a system the question is not one of freedom; for no one familiar with the facts would dream of saying that these University institutions are at all free to train teachers as they like. The real question is whether under this system there is any single step of importance which even a University can take of its own independent motion, and without the risk of reversal by the Board. Vigilance is good; but it is hard to praise a system calculated to convert men of initiative

for expenditure on teaching, &c., is given on pp. xiv-xv, Appendix A, No. 1, as £19,896.

into timid schemers, and to keep institutions of vigorous potentialities trotting submissively in the blinkers of routine. If people are always being told what they must do, they will soon cease to trouble about what they might do. It is indeed deeply to be regretted that in place of that well-understood treaty or concordat which should exist between every University institution and the Board of Education, in place of that principle of progress by conference which should be the pivot of the administrative scheme, there prevails a system under which these institutions are only able to gain respect for their views either by personal appeal (a method agreeable but irregular), or by rallying the forces of external pressure, or by committing themselves to the hazards of an epistolary scuffle with the Board.

III.

The paramount importance to national education of maintaining the independence of Universities, the contingency of the responsibilities of the State towards University education passing to the undivided control of the Board of Education, and, if so, the risks which must attend the administration and interpretation of that control, are questions which should be pressed upon the attention of Universities and the public. The prospect of the concentration of all such control in the hands of the Board is not visionary. Great strides have been made in that direction. Already the Board of Education, besides regulating the training of teachers, have their grip upon technical schools and schools of art, and several Universities now earn large grants annually by conforming to the regulations of the Board for technical day-work. Quite recently the Medical Schools attached to Universities have been recognised by the Board for the purposes of grant, and by all accounts they are already being smartly peppered with schedules. Important grants for agricultural education are distributed among certain Universities and University Colleges by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries. But the Board of Education are also busy with the promotion of agricultural education, and if their attempt not long ago to strip the rival Board of its jurisdiction has been partially repulsed, Goliath is perhaps only restrained from making fresh onslaughts by the fraying bands of a makeshift concordat, and by a confident anticipation that the present division of control must before long prove unworkable. The same prospect of a single control presents itself in connexion with the future administration of the Treasury grants in aid

of Universities and University Colleges. Hitherto these grants have been administered by the Treasury with the assistance of a small Advisory Committee. But it has not escaped notice that this Advisory Committee was appointed 'with the concurrence of the Board of Education,'* and that the annual volume of 'Reports from those Universities and 'University Colleges in Great Britain which participated in the 'Parliamentary Grant for University Colleges' is laid before Parliament with a preface by the President of the same Board. The 'Morning Post' (August 5, 1910), in commenting upon the preface for the current year, urges the Board to deal at greater length and more authoritatively with questions of University policy. Some authorities, indeed, definitely urge that all the responsibilities of the State towards University education should be entrusted to a single department of administration—namely, the Board of Education. Sir William Anson, for example, in a debate in the House of Commons on the Education Estimates on July 13, 1910, is reported to have said that 'with regard to the University Colleges and the grants 'made by the Treasury and the Board of Education, he thought 'it would be more satisfactory, in view of the risks of overlapping, if the whole matter were placed in the hands of the 'Board of Education.' Yet only a few days later, the Vice-Chancellor of Bristol University, Sir Isambard Owen, speaking on behalf of a deputation from his University to the Treasury, 'expressed a strong preference for all University grants being 'administered by the Treasury rather than by the Board of 'Education.'† It is at once apparent that Sir William Anson speaks as an administrator, and perhaps with reservations, and Sir Isambard Owen as a man answerable for the integrity of a University. If the problem of the relationship of Universities to the State is merely one of administration, if our sole anxiety should be to avert such disasters as overlapping, Sir William Anson is in the right. But if, without prejudice to the ultimate form of the solution, we are to insist upon the principle that any administration of University education stands condemned if it molests and impairs the freedom of Universities and their responsibility for their own policy, we shall respect the caution of the Vice-Chancellor of Bristol. It deserves note that in the same debate in the House of Commons, Sir William Anson was moved to describe an action of the Board in regard to a certain school as 'a process of

* See Treasury Minute, February 14, 1902.

† *Times*, July 22, 1910.

‘successful persecution,’ and to make vigorous reference to cases ‘in which the administration of the Department left a ‘burning sense of injustice.’ * These are not very reassuring auguries.

The recent acceptance by Mr. Lloyd George of the general principle that the new Universities and University Colleges should be allowed to spend at their discretion the grants in aid which they receive from the Treasury is a valuable point gained, for it should mean that in this respect at least the institutions will be free to direct their own policy. But the admission of this point is not decisive of the main issue. It does not settle the general question of the relation of Universities to the State, nor does it relieve them of anxieties concerning the possibilities of the future. It does not determine the important question whether all University grants are to be administered through the Board of Education alone. The Universities should seize the opportunity, which may be brief, to clear up their views upon this crucial point, and to formulate the conditions for which they are prepared to press. Until they are united upon terms and have some prospect of securing them, they will probably be well advised if, for the present, they endeavour to secure a continuance of the existing dual, or even triple, system of administration. Before they hasten unguardedly to the arms of the Board of Education, let them make sure that their constitutions will survive the vigour of the embrace. It might be difficult to administer them to death; but it would not be impossible to administer them to a state of suspended animation.

This question of University independence and integrity is of momentous importance to the whole of English education, now and hereafter, for it is upon the Universities that the brunt of the battle for the purity of educational standards must fall. They are the natural and proper exponents of educational ideas and aims, and their decisions and their practice determine the aspirations and the performance of those who look to them for guidance. Forty-three years ago Sir John Seeley declared that education in England is what the Universities choose to make it. If the Universities were to surrender their prerogative to a department of the State, the saying would still be true, but with an added sting. They and they alone can guide us, if they will, through the thronging temptations of an age of indolent compromise and astute materialism. It is for them to keep within bounds by the fire of criticism and the power of true culture ‘the thundering noise of the education-mongers,’ who together

* *Times*, July 14, 1910.

with the whole tribe of false doctors infest every part of the educational field. It is for the Universities to interpose themselves as a bulwark against the debasement of educational ideals at the will and pleasure of commercial instincts, or popular clamour, or utilitarian ambitions. The rendering of such a service demands a fidelity to principle, a constancy of policy, which it is unreasonable to require or to expect in a Government department, however able or well-intentioned. For Government departments are, and must be, the playthings of politics. Twice at least of recent years we have seen the Board of Education abruptly introduce, at the dictation of party clamour, drastic innovations upon their previous policy ; on one occasion in regard to secondary schools, and on the other in regard to training colleges. The plain truth is that democracy at large cannot control education without destroying its real value ; for when education becomes the mirror of popular standards, when the populace dictates its substance and aim, then it becomes impossible for education to lead the people to things above themselves. Precisely for that reason, a University, while ever zealous to help the people and to understand their aspirations, should never be subjected to merely popular control, or to the control of those who themselves are agents of the popular will. In brief, if University education is to help the people in their quest for enlightenment, the freedom and independence of Universities must at all costs be preserved.

The Universities are indeed the trustees of the mind. Their supreme duty is not to make the nation more wealthy or its public life more efficient, nor to delight it by lengthy lists of serviceable results, but rather to vindicate the dignity of thought, the disinterested pursuit of knowledge, and the training of character, and to protect these things against all attacks. They are at permanent warfare with all activity in education which is not founded upon knowledge and principle, with all intellectual pretence, with all latitudinarian indifference, with all sharp opportunism, and with all educational huckstering. The true University is ' a living and energising body ' ; and as such it can never submit to that incubus of regulation, officialdom, and routine which more and more characterises both central and local administration and is slowly suppressing initiative and variety in English education. It is then for the sake of their own vitality, and for the sake of the welfare of national education in all its forms, that Universities must jealously guard their freedom and independence.

ART. IV.—THE PRINCIPLES OF HEREDITY.

1. *The Laws of Heredity*. By G. ARCHDALL REID. London : Methuen. 1910.
2. *Mendel's Principles of Heredity*. By W. BATESON. Cambridge : At the University Press. 1909.
3. *Phases of Evolution and Heredity*. By DAVID BERRY HART. London : Rebman. 1910.

IT is an interesting question as to how far the solution of a vexed problem is facilitated by the preliminary study of previous attempts to solve it. Most people, if asked off-hand, would regard it as an axiom that the history of opinion on the subject they are studying must be of some value in advancing that study. Yet in many of the problems of science, and still more in the problems of philosophy, we are inclined to believe that correct solutions are more likely to be achieved by a mind coming fresh from the prevailing intellectual atmosphere of modern times than by one that is steeped in the heterogeneous mixture of truth and absurdity which emanated from a less scientific era. We would not, of course, suggest that historical studies are devoid of interest or value—far from it; but we would suggest that the most profitable attitude with which to approach them is rather that of the archæologist, whose opinions on modern problems are already formed, and whose interest in the past is purely abstract and impersonal, than that of the scientist who looks for new light on old questions. A chorus of dissent will no doubt greet this heretical proposition. Yet we think it can be supported on sound psychological grounds. We might urge, if we liked, that the history of opinions being mainly a history of errors, it would generally be an unremunerative investment of time to search over the masses of chaff for the few grains of wheat they may contain. But such is not our line of argument. We mean something much more positive than this. We mean that a mind encumbered with pre-existing theories of a subject is to that extent incapacitated from entertaining any theory that is new or out of relation to what has gone before. A mind that comes direct from a study of the past is likely to reach solutions of problems not widely different from the solutions of the past. But a mind whose only preparation is derived from immersion in the disciplined scientific atmosphere of the time is more likely to arrive at a solution on novel lines. Old conclusions

were wrong, usually because wrong questions were asked, false issues were raised. Whether the question is answered 'Yes' or 'No' matters little if the question is irrelevant. If the controversy of Free Will and Determinism had never been raised, its solution in these days could hardly have been asked. But since the issue has been raised, and a false antithesis fixed in the language with its obscurantist and question-begging terminology, the problem is one that is likely long to perplex intellects worthy of a higher destiny.

The common view of heredity is comprised in the detection of a resemblance between parents and offspring: human beings always give birth to human beings, not to fishes or amphibians; and each individual is apt to resemble his parents more than other members of the species. This, being the obvious, is assumed to be the significant, fact of heredity. As usual, fundamental importance is attributed to what is only an accessory appearance. It is of course perfectly true as far as it goes, but it does not and cannot go any farther.

Montaigne gives admirable expression to the ordinary point of view in his essay 'Of the resemblance between children and fathers':

'What monster is it, that this teare or drop of seed, whereof we are ingendred brings with it; and in it the impressions, not only of the corporall forme, but even of the very thoughts and inclinations of our fathers? Where doth this droppe of water containe or lodge this infinite number of formes? And how beare they these resemblances, of so rash, and unruly a progresse, that the childes child shall be answerable to his grandfather, and the nephew to his uncle? In the family of *Lepidus* the Roman, there have been three, not successively, but some between, that were borne with one same eye covered with a cartilage or gristle. There was a race in *Thebes*, which from their mothers wombe, bear the forme of a burre, or yron of a launce; and such as had it not, were judged as misbegotten and deemed unlawfull. *Aristotle* reporteth of a certain nation, with whom all women were common, where children were allotted their fathers, only by their resemblances.*'

But in Montaigne's time, no glimmering was yet possible of the scientific conceptions which were destined to oust the popular views. Let us then try to forget all about our notions of heredity, and enter upon the discussion of this great mystery of living matter from an avenue altogether different.

There is a very general agreement among biologists that life no longer originates *de novo* upon the Earth. The theory of evolution certainly implies that at some period or other

* Florio's translation, 1632.

inorganic matter became organic. That organic matter was no doubt far simpler and more elementary than any form of life which we have yet been able to discover. The lowest forms of life known to us, single-celled monads to which by courtesy the name of animal or plant is extended, all exhibit a variety of functions which lead us to believe that they themselves must be the product of aeons of previous evolution. They are of constant type, they often possess a nucleus or a contractile vacuole which at definite intervals empties itself; they have the power of the absorption and digestion of suitable food, and the rejection of matter that is unsuitable; their reproduction, by dividing in two, is well established as a property of their protoplasm. Clearly the gap between this and inorganic matter is a wide one, which must have been bridged over by innumerable intermediate forms of life now supposed to have vanished for ever.

Our earliest view of life, then, is that of minute protoplasmic particles, often showing great activity, absorbing a certain amount of nutriment, and then dividing into two. When each of these new beings has absorbed sufficient nutriment to grow to the standard size of the species, they again each undergo division. In this simple manner the numbers of the species are constantly replenished and increased to whatever limit the nature of the environment will allow. Now it is important to observe that with these lowly creatures there is no such thing as death. Immortality is characteristic of the group. Instead of dying when they have lived a certain term, they simply divide, and each portion commences life afresh. Of course we do not mean to deny that large numbers die from accidents or starvation—were it otherwise the world could not possibly contain them; but such death is an accident, and not due to any senility or diminished aptitude for life of the organism itself. Indeed, all existing organisms of the kind we are discussing have, so we must believe, descended from an unbroken line of ancestry reaching back to the time when the Earth had only lately emerged from the molten stage. In the whole of this ancestry, death has never occurred. The organism living to-day is not a different organism but the same organism as its progenitor millions of generations back; modified very likely in habits and appearance, but not in any sense a new individual. In these humblest forms of life, death has not yet made its appearance; and it has in consequence been suggested by certain biologists that death is an acquired character, having no immediate significance for the preservation of the species.

By and by, as ages roll on, our immortal organisms begin

to take on new functions. The continuous series of divisions is found to be broken occasionally by a new phenomenon. Two organisms, instead of going through the usual routine, meet one another and fuse together to form one organism. The creature thus produced appears to differ in no way from the rest of its kind. It begins to divide and re-divide in the orthodox manner just as if nothing had happened. This earliest form of sexual reproduction, it will be observed, in no wise interferes with the continued immortality of the individuals. Death has still not made its appearance. Very much later than the appearance of sexual reproduction,* a new change takes place. The division of the cell into its two daughter-cells is incomplete; and the two new individuals formed by the cleavage of the old, instead of going their ways separately, remain adherent. They each, however, go on dividing, as their nature is; and, the divisions being incomplete, a cluster or colony is formed. Such colonies we find among the sponges or hydrozoa, such as corals and zoophytes. They form the lowest class of the metazoa, or animals which consist of more than a single cell. As we trace the evolution of these animals down the river of time, we find further important changes taking place. At first, the organisms which had been incompletely separated retain their individualities unimpaired. Often indeed they must have escaped and gone off on their own account, to divide and re-divide as of old. But as the tendency to form colonies became more pronounced, various concomitant changes ensue. The adherent organisms begin to lose their separate individuality, and to become modified in various ways which, while rendering them unfit for a separate existence, make them more serviceable members of the community to which they belong. The modification is in the direction of increasing specialisation and differentiation of functions. Instead of each organism performing all the vital processes for itself, it tends more and more to perform only one, while relying upon the other organisms of the colony to perform for it the others. Some cells thus become modified for catching the food, others for digesting it, others for carrying it in proper quantities to the various members of the community, others for locomotion, and finally there are some cells—the basis of the whole—which go on dividing and re-dividing just as if nothing had happened, ever sending forth new individuals into the world, to found once more new colonies. As the various organisms slowly become more

* Sexual reproduction may have been present from the first—or, at all events, from the time when constancy of type was attained.

subservient to their colony, it often becomes difficult to know whether a given cluster is more properly called an individual consisting of many cells or a colony of separate individuals. But with further evolution, the question is resolved. The individuals become completely subordinated; and it is no longer possible to look upon the cluster as anything but a single organism composed of a nation of cells.

Let us now note the bearing of these changes upon the subject of heredity. Through the vast alterations we have traced, one fact has stood out conspicuously unchanged. We pointed out how the fundamental feature of the primitive organism was its constant division into two new organisms. That basis of life has never been lost. The primary cell does indeed produce a number of cells which are imperfectly separated and become specialised and differentiated, but it continues at the same time to divide into other cells, the same as itself, which *do* become separated and go their own way. The budding forth of the adherent cells is not the transformation of the old power to divide, but the addition of a new power. Through all the changes and evolution of life, the primary cell has never lost any fraction of its power to divide into two cells, each of which thereupon commences a new and independent life. It has merely acquired a power of producing a sort of excrescence upon itself, which aids in its own preservation from accidents. Nor has the primary cell lost anything of its pristine immortality. It never dies; only the excrescences get after a time worn out and die; they alone are mortal. We see then that the fundamental fact of life is a single cell, having the power to divide into two, and possessed thereby of a potential immortality. The difference between the protozoa and the metazoa is that in the protozoa each cell is complete in itself, whereas in the metazoa it grows an excrescence upon it which usually is so large as to mask the very existence of the primary cell, and to be mistaken for the individual itself. In biological parlance, we call the primary cell the germ-cell or germ-plasm, while the excrescence is known as the soma or soma-plasm. It is now easily seen how erroneous must be the notions of heredity that arise from a cursory or 'common-sense' view. *We are the excrescences.* In human beings, above all other animals, that subordination of the individual cells to the needs of the whole colony has proceeded with the utmost thoroughness. Our life is the corporate life of the whole mass of cells of which we are composed. Our consciousness is a corporate consciousness, possessed of a unity differing from what would be afforded by a multitude of independent cells. We are far, indeed, from

affirming that our individual cells may not have to some extent a consciousness of their own, just as they have to some extent a life of their own. The difficulty of stating at what precise point in evolution consciousness first appeared is easiest solved by assuming it to be a property of protoplasm itself; so that even the lowest single-celled animals have a rudimentary consciousness, in the same manner that their protoplasm possesses in itself some of the rudimentary properties of a nervous system. It may be that our consciousness is after all nothing but the aggregate consciousnesses of the nation of individual cells of which we consist. We have little faith in the method of those German psychologists who, after searching deeply the recesses of their own souls, come to the surface again and declare that consciousness is an indivisible, unalterable unity. They would no doubt have thought the same of their bodies, if biology had allowed them to think so. However this may be, we must admit that our life and consciousness stands and falls with the soma, not with the germ-plasm; not with the primary immortal cell itself, but with the highly perishable excrescence which grows upon it.

Have we not here an entirely sufficient cause for any number of false theories on the subject of heredity? Our outlook is necessarily that of the soma or excrescence; around us and our soma-plasm the world appears to revolve; the very existence of germ-plasm was not noted till a few years ago. To convince ourselves that the germ-plasm is the basis of life, and the soma but a chance appanage thereto, requires a greater revolution in our mode of thought than most men are capable of. We recognise the different kinds of germ-plasm by the different kinds of excrescences which they grow upon themselves; species and genera are not regarded as classifications of germ-plasms, but only of the excrescences which they display. Yet by regarding the matter at the beginning from the right point of view, many of the mysteries of heredity at once vanish away. That an animal should produce offspring having a close resemblance to itself appears from the ordinary point of view an almost inexplicable phenomenon. But when we reflect that both parent and offspring have arisen from a common germ-plasm which had acquired the habit of budding forth excrescences of definite structure, the similarity no longer appears so wonderful. The fundamental fact about each individual is not his soma, but his germ-plasm. Regarded in this light, the offspring is not a new individual sprung from his parent, but a portion of the very same germ-plasm. This germ-plasm, so far from being

new, has existed since the dawn of life upon the Earth. It has survived all the vicissitudes of earth, air, and water ; and it has undergone evolution in so far that, having had originally no power to bud forth a soma at all, it finally has acquired the power of budding forth the immensely complex soma called a man. Our fish ancestors, swimming about in the sea, had not a different germ-plasm from ours, but the same. Their germ-plasm has survived and by continual divisions, slowly acquiring new characters, that very same germ-plasm which formerly budded out a fish, now buds out a man. Yet it still retains a few piscine characteristics, as in the gill-slits which the human foetus exhibits at a certain stage in its developement, and which are occasionally found present even at birth.

We have hitherto written as though there were no such thing as sexual reproduction. Everyone knows that among all animals and plants, with the possible exception of the very lowest, sexual reproduction takes place either as the condition of the developement of a new soma, or (as in parthenogenesis) now and again after long series of asexually-produced generations. But the introduction of this additional factor in no wise affects the principle of the foregoing description. The germ-plasm is not less the same germ-plasm because two different portions of it have to be mingled before a new generation can arise. What, then, is the function of sexual reproduction ? When we consider its universality and the immense complexity of the structures and functions which have evolved to subserve it, it is clear that it must have arisen in response to some very deep-rooted necessity.

Whatever may be ultimately accepted as the proper definition of a species, it is obvious that sexual reproduction is a condition of the existence of species. The germ-plasm is for ever varying in all directions. All the variations that are favourable tend to be preserved. Hence, in the absence of sexual reproduction, any particular germ-plasm that chanced to commence variation in any favourable direction would continue to evolve on lines of its own, independently of any other germ-plasm. Instead of a multitude of similar individuals grouped into a species, we should have diversity everywhere, and a system of biological individualism. Sexual reproduction, then, has at least the one obvious function of pooling divergent variations. The new individual has to combine in itself the variations of *two* pre-existing individuals ; and new individuals can only be produced where the variations of its parents are not incompatible. It does not at first strike the casual observer how marvellously

thorough is the unification of the racial germ-plasm achieved by sexual reproduction. We are all aware that we each have two parents in the generation immediately preceding our own. We know also that one generation further back we have four grandparents. We may possibly have reflected that in the same manner we have eight great-grandparents, and sixteen great-great-grandparents. But most people have not carried the process far enough to calculate that in the tenth generation back, if we exclude intermarriages, the number of our progenitors was 1024. Still fewer people have considered that, again excluding intermarriages, the number of our progenitors in the twenty-first generation back exceeds two millions. Now, putting a generation at thirty years, we conclude that six hundred years ago the number of persons existing who have borne a part in the production of our own individual body exceeded two millions. But six hundred years ago, or somewhat less, when the Black Death had ravaged the country from end to end, the whole population of England probably did not exceed two millions. On the supposition, therefore, that there have been no intermarriages, and no admixture of foreign blood, we must each represent in our own body the germ-plasm and the characteristics of the entire population of England less than six centuries ago!

The case is no otherwise if, instead of tracing the generations backwards into the past, we trace them forwards into the future. We are loth to inflict further arithmetic upon the reader; probably he will be only too ready to accept our statement that, if the numbers of the race remain stationary and other conditions are as before, his living progeny six hundred years hence are not likely to number less than two millions. From these two examples we gather a clear impression of the everlasting process of diffusion and re-integration of the germ-plasm. In the first example, the scattered germ-plasms of two million people have united in the production of one; in the second example, the germ-plasm of one individual has diffused into the inheritance of two millions. It is mere fancy for anyone to-day to point out a definite individual several centuries back as 'his ancestor.' The people of to-day are in a body the children of the people of ancient times. The inheritance has been completely diffused and intermingled; so that, going back some centuries, it would be much harder to find a man who was not our ancestor than one who was.*

* That is, if we exclude persons whose descendants have altogether died out.

Here we see the meaning of the word 'species,' or 'race,' or other unit of classification. Such unit is made up of nothing more than an inter-breeding nation of cousins. The germ-plasm of a species, then, may be regarded as a single unity scattered momentarily throughout the individuals of the species and always conserved by the individuals; but always also being mixed up at the initiation of each new generation, so that the unity and identity of the germ-plasm is preserved, and the chance variation of any single part of it is in course of generations diffused throughout the whole. Here at all events is a sufficient explanation of the occurrence of sexual reproduction. The old view that the germ-plasm became worn out and required periodical 'rejuvenation' finds no support from modern theories.*

We have attempted to describe the facts with which the student of heredity is confronted on first looking into the subject. We shall now be in a favourable position to form a judgement on the theories put forward to account for the facts. Without such preliminary survey of the groundwork of life, we should find ourselves totally at a loss in dealing with the various hypotheses and speculations. If our outlook were that which 'common-sense' indicates—i.e. that taken by the normal man who, while ignorant of the very elements of the subject, is also ignorant of his own ignorance; if, we say, our outlook were that dictated by 'common-sense,' we should suppose the fundamental fact of life to be the individuals whom we can see and feel so plainly, and the fundamental fact of heredity to be the conjugation of two such individuals, resulting in the production of a new one like themselves. To those whose view is thus limited heredity may well seem, not only an unsolved, but an insoluble mystery. So long as we regard man, the individual, as the centre of all things, and orientate our thoughts with exclusive reference to him, heredity will remain the complete enigma that the motions of the heavenly bodies appeared when it was supposed that the Earth was the centre of the universe. We must orientate our thoughts, not about the transitory excrescence upon the germ-plasm, that we can touch and see, but about the germ-plasm itself, which is not transitory and which in the truest sense constitutes the race or the species. We must look upon any particular species

* Rejuvenation can hardly be described as a theory or explanation, but merely as a name to cover our ignorance of the facts. Weismann's theory of sexual reproduction is almost the converse of that described in the text.

as being a mass of germ-plasm, divided up into little portions which are carried about in the bodies of the individuals which it grows on itself, and fitted with an arrangement for the continuous merging of the isolated portions of germ-plasm in the common stock once more, so that comparative homogeneity is maintained within the confines of the species. Carrying with us this aspect of life, let us now approach the books whose titles are placed at the head of this article.

Dr. Archdall Reid's book, 'The Laws of Heredity,' is a work of very varied merits. In parts it is moderately good, in other parts it is exceedingly good, and in other parts again it is exceedingly bad. The portion which can be recommended with the greatest confidence is that in which Dr. Reid treats of his own professional subject—disease. Whatever criticism we may have to make on other parts, this part alone is sufficient to render the book important and deserving the attention of the public. The part to which we take the strongest possible exception is the psychological part, in which the author's views can only be compared with the crudest materialism of Karl Vogt. 'That the brain secretes thought as the liver 'secretes bile' is a proposition which Dr. Reid thinks contains 'some element of truth.' This fact alone should suffice to condemn his psychological judgement in the opinion of nearly everyone. But its applications soon get him into inextricable difficulties. He is driven to attack the 'automaton' hypothesis, as defended by Huxley and W. K. Clifford. Well may he shelter himself behind the authority of William James. There is no modern psychologist for whom we have a greater respect; but James was always more of a 'philosopher' than a man of science, and his disbelief in the automaton hypothesis carries with us no sort of weight. But Dr. Reid speaks as a biologist, addressing the public, and we cannot but think it unfortunate that he should have committed himself with so little preliminary study. We say advisedly with 'little preliminary study;' for nowhere in Dr. Reid's attack do we observe any reference to the principle of 'conservation of energy' or to many other of the leading facts on which the automaton hypothesis is founded. The thesis of the automaton theory is that the bodily sequences and the mental sequences are two radically different things, that the material bodily sequences constitute in themselves a closed circuit, wholly subject to the laws of physics and chemistry. Dr. Reid, with his gross materialism, appears to consider mind as a force, of character not altogether different from heat or motion; and therefore it naturally does not appear to him incongruous that it should break into the

material forces which follow physical and chemical laws. Why does he not stand out boldly and defend a 'vital principle' at once? His theory, indeed, though not his words, involves the very fallacy that underlay the theory of a 'vital principle.' 'Though not his words' have we said? We are not sure that, even here, we have not judged him too favourably. For in another part, speaking of the reaction between toxins and anti-toxins, he describes the process as being a 'vital' rather than a chemical one.

Let us not dwell, however, upon this unscientific portion of 'The Laws of Heredity.' It will be more profitable to discuss the theories that are proper to the subject-matter of the work and first we may say a word as to its literary character. Some men of science are contemptuous of literary form. We have previously urged in this Review that men of science have no more right than other writers to turn out a book in any but the best literary form of which they are capable. To make a book pleasant to read, instead of unpleasant, ought surely to be an object of everyone's ambition, and will do more to promote the popularity of science than any amount of sneering at literature—a sneering which is too often an affectation put on to cover literary impotence. There can be no reason, for instance, why Dr. Reid should always be beginning his sentences with the word 'therefore.' It is inelegant, and wholly unnecessary. More inelegant still is the statement that measles and other diseases are 'usually always' present in towns. Then again there have crept into biological literature a number of pairs of antithetical terms which are in the highest degree ugly. Such, for instance, are 'latency' and 'patency' of characters; 'survival' and 'arrival' of the fittest; 'nature' and 'nurture.' The contrasted terms have no sort of intrinsic suitability to express the idea; they appear to have been selected for no other reason than that they rhyme together. The choice of a suitable terminology for such a science as biology is so vastly important that we cannot but regret that words should be chosen merely because they have a sort of unmusical rhyme—such a rhyme, too, as would indelibly disgrace the feeblest poetaster. If science is occasionally regarded as philistine, must we not set it down to the aberrations of her mediocre expositors? This observation, however, has no special application to Dr. Archdall Reid.

On opening Dr. Reid's volume we find it dedicated to the memory of Thomas Henry Huxley, 'a great exponent of 'scientific method.' That Huxley is here correctly described everyone will agree; most persons, also, will think that his

greatest contribution to method, as it was certainly that on which he most insisted, was his root-and-branch distrust of deduction and generalisation in the sphere of biology. We were therefore not a little surprised to find that Dr. Reid's book is worked out largely by the deductive method, and that in fact he devotes a whole chapter to the advocacy of that method, which he considers has been unduly neglected in biological inquiries. What would Huxley have thought of his depreciation of the experimental method, of his talk about 'hard thinking' and 'rigorous deductive inference of consequences'? Even were this sound—and we think it radically unsound—it would be of little utility; for, all the world over, 'hard thinking' leads different people to different conclusions, and its adoption would merely lead to sectarian strife, from which true conclusions can rarely emerge. Let us give one or two instances. Dr. Reid, by dint of 'hard thinking,' arrives at the conclusion that acquired characters are not transmissible and that such an occurrence would imply a miracle. Now Herbert Spencer, also by dint of hard thinking, arrived at the precisely opposite conclusion, saying that it was *inconceivable* that acquired characters should not be inherited and that such a thing would be miraculous. Dr. Reid will scarcely say that Herbert Spencer was not a hard thinker. What then is the use of this kind of argument? Again Dr. Reid says, 'When we compare one modern species with another, the more intelligent type invariably has, proportionately to the size of its body, a larger brain. Thus the dog has a larger brain than a rabbit, and a man than a dog.' If Dr. Reid had spent his time, instead of thinking out this conclusion, in the comparatively vulgar occupation of dissecting a porpoise, he would have found his generalisation promptly disposed of.* For the porpoise, possessing a large and highly complex brain, has neither the intelligence nor the capacity to develop an intelligence to anything like a co-ordinate degree. Dr. Reid may then reflect that the brain is not only an intellectual and thinking organ, as he has somewhat hastily assumed, but also the organ of emotion and of muscular innervation, controlling the bodily activities. We do not, indeed, suggest that a porpoise is more emotional than other animals; but it has a power of rapid motion that would be almost incredible from a mere inspection of its body; and this co-ordinated motility demands a size of brain that scatters Dr. Reid's 'hard thinking' to the winds. We are

* The example here given is that used by Huxley to destroy the same generalisation, more than half a century ago.

informed by an eminent specialist that small animals in general, such as fleas, have larger brains in proportion to their size than large animals ; also that the brains of women are proportionally larger than the brains of men. According to Dr. Reid, therefore, small animals must be more intelligent than large and women than men. We have several other notes of unfortunate deductions in this work, but we will forbear ; let us deal directly with Dr. Reid's view of evolution.

Dr. Reid is an exponent of the extreme school which asserts that natural selection is the sole and sufficient factor in organic evolution. Offspring tend to vary from their parents in all directions. While many such variations will be unfavourable to the life of the offspring, some will happen to be favourable. Individuals which have undergone unfavourable variations will have on the average a shortened life and a diminished number of offspring. Those, on the contrary, which have undergone favourable variations will have a better chance of survival and of producing a numerous progeny. Favourable variations thus tend to perpetuate themselves and spread through the species ; while the struggle for existence will generally cut off those individuals who have varied in an unfavourable direction. If it is true that this solitary factor is sufficient to account for evolution, as Dr. Reid holds in common with a great many other biologists, it becomes interesting to trace its application to the human species. This Dr. Reid has succeeded in doing with conspicuous success. Given the correctness of the premises, the deductions appear to us unimpeachable.

The fundamental cause of evolution is found in the cutting off of unfavourable variations. By seeking the sources of mortality, therefore, we ascertain what sort of unfavourable variations in human beings are now being eradicated by natural selection, and therefore in what direction the race is evolving. ' In the vast majority of instances civilised men die of disease. ' Disease, then, is the only stringently selective agent amongst ' civilised men. The types it weeds out are those that are weak ' against disease, the survivors are those that are resistant to ' disease : it follows that the only racial progression, certainly ' the only considerable racial progression, that civilised human ' races undergo is one against disease.' Through the constant weeding out of individuals susceptible to disease, and the preservation and multiplication of those who are congenitally less susceptible, the race is mainly carried on from the latter ; and the species must be acquiring an immunity to all diseases to which it has long been exposed. An examination of the facts soon proves the truthfulness of this conclusion. The climate of

West Africa is notoriously deadly to the Englishman, belonging to a race that has had no experience of West African diseases, and has therefore acquired no immunity against them. But to the West African negro the climate is healthy : during many generations past, natural selection has rooted out all those susceptible to malaria and yellow fever, leaving only those who are relatively insusceptible. Contrariwise the climate of London, healthy to an Englishman, is deadly to the West African negro. Londoners, having lived through centuries of tuberculosis, are relatively immune, while the West African has undergone no evolution against that terrible disease. 'To the 'Polynesian or Red Indian, whose race has had even less experience of this disease, a residence in any one of our great cities 'is usually equivalent to a sentence of death.' From very ancient times a continuous stream of negroes has flowed into Asia and Southern Europe as slaves : they have often been kindly treated and achieved wealth and power. Yet in a few generations they have become extinct. 'A permanent colony 'of native Africans in the midst of an ancient tuberculosis-infected civilisation is impossible.' In America only, where the negroes had already undergone some evolution against tuberculosis before their importation, they have survived, unlike the vanishing aborigines. But it is still said that 'every 'other adult negro dies of consumption.' Thus it happens that the great intermingling of races which has occurred during the last few hundred years has inevitably been attended by the extinction of many of them. One race, which has been subject for centuries to a microbic disease and is therefore relatively immune, carries this disease to another race which, having never previously experienced it, dies off in a few generations. Here also we get an explanation of that remarkable induction from history, that in time a conquered race always absorbs the conquerors, while the reverse process never happens. 'The 'Greeks and Romans were expelled from their acquisitions. The 'Normans were absorbed. The Moors have left scarcely a trace 'in Spain,' and so on. The exception is when the conquerors bring with them new and virulent diseases, which completely exterminate the native races. This has been the important factor in the growth of the British Empire. Wherever they have gone the British have exterminated the natives, not with the sword, but with the diseases that they brought ; thus leaving great voids, which the incomers speedily filled up.

Other instances of the same process may be seen in the recent opening up of East Africa. Sleeping sickness had long been endemic and therefore comparatively harmless in West Africa.

When the movements of trade carried it across the continent, where it was previously unknown, its ravages were such as to shock all humanity. The recent introduction of syphilis into Uganda has been attended with effects no less appalling than sleeping sickness. At the present time, more than half the population of the Protectorate suffer from the disease, and in parts of the country no less than 90 per cent. The disease, moreover, is far more virulent in character than anything known in European countries.*

But the most terrible example of the rise of new diseases among a race inexperienced to them is to be found on the first contact of the Old and New Worlds. 'On the one side of the Atlantic were people who for thousands or tens of thousands of years had been slowly evolving resisting power against a multitude of maladies—peoples whose increase had been very slow, largely because of the numbers of the unfit that had perished from disease.' On the Western side of the Atlantic were a people who had never been touched by any of these diseases, except malaria and probably syphilis. Immediately 'the natives melted away, and now are found almost solely in remote and thinly populated wilds, where a nomadic life affords some protection.' The voyage of Christopher Columbus was thus fraught with more tremendous results for humanity than could be then conceived. On that fateful voyage, the crew carried with them the germ of death for millions of persons. Probably the New World was not without its revenges, however; for there is strong evidence (from which Dr. Reid seems to dissent) that in the island of Haiti the crew of Christopher Columbus picked up the syphilis which they subsequently carried back to Europe. At all events it is known that the pilot, Pinzen, and certain others of the crew were affected with a disease with symptoms closely resembling syphilis; and that syphilis made its first appearance in history a few years later

* It is not often realised how enormous a quantity of the evil in the world is caused by officious persons, of the very best intentions. The introduction of syphilis into Uganda was largely due to the teaching of the missionaries. They taught that polygamy was wicked, and attempted to introduce monogamy, which, being unsuited both to the past habits and to the present civilisation of the people, led to a great deterioration of feminine virtue, followed by the rise of the terrible venereal scourge. See evidence of members of the Church Missionary Society and the White Fathers in the Protectorate, collected by Colonel Lambkin on behalf of the Colonial Office and published in vol. ii. of D'Arcy Power's 'System of Syphilis.'

as an epidemic disease in the army of Charles VIII before Naples in 1495, where it was supposed to have come from Portugal. Its excessive virulence at that time was such as characterises new diseases at all times and places.

According to Dr. Reid's theory, therefore, which in our opinion follows indisputably upon his view of natural selection, the chief evolution of the human race for centuries past has been their evolution against disease. As a corollary from this view, we may perceive the danger which might attend a complete extinction of disease from certain parts of the world while it is still allowed to linger in other parts. Endemic disease acts as a safety valve against epidemic disease. The frightful epidemics of plague and cholera which have at intervals devastated Europe in the past have always spread from the East, where they have existed for long ages in endemic form in comparatively small proportions. But to the inexperienced bodies of West Europeans these epidemics have been so deadly as half to depopulate whole countries. Endemic disease of long standing protects a race. By killing off those most susceptible, it maintains the race in a state of partial immunity. It acts, in short, like vaccination of the race. But if we were to succeed in exterminating such a disease, for instance, as smallpox from this and other countries (making vaccination unnecessary) the race would soon lapse into a condition of extreme susceptibility; and if in some part of the world the extermination had been incomplete, it might suddenly recur with such virulence as to sweep away the whole of civilisation.

On this point only one observation remains to be made. It is this: that on the theory of the all-sufficiency of natural selection zymotic disease can never produce racial degeneration, nor be inherited. The stock cases of 'inherited' disease are regarded as due to a direct infection of the foetus before birth, having nothing to do with heredity. This deduction is again borne out by facts. 'Nearly all human races have been exposed to disease for thousands of years, and in no instance is there to be found an iota of evidence that any race has, as a consequence, become degenerate, or that any race has transmuted acquired into inborn immunity.' In short, the sole effect of disease on a race is to weed out susceptible individuals, leaving the race to be carried on by those whose congenital susceptibility is small.

Hitherto we have considered only the selective effect of the zymotic diseases upon humanity; but one of the most interesting of Dr. Reid's applications is the selective effect of disease produced by narcotics, especially alcohol and opium. The rational discussion of this question is rendered difficult, as

Dr. Reid truly remarks, by the passionate bigotry of temperance reformers and others, whose state of mind is as far removed from scientific calmness and impartiality as anything can well be. But even the bigotry of temperance reformers cannot obscure the fact that alcohol, or its concomitant diseases, is a very large cause of mortality. An inquiry by a committee of the British Medical Association pointed to the conclusion that one death in seven is wholly or partly due to alcohol. In insurance companies which separate abstainers from non-abstainers the mortality among the former is markedly lower than that among the latter. 'On the average the members of the Friendly Society of Rechabites, who are abstainers, live longer and have less sickness than Oddfellows and Foresters. The mortality among grocers has increased appreciably since they were permitted to sell wine and spirits.' It follows, therefore, that alcohol acts as a very stringent selective factor upon humanity. Those who are congenitally inclined towards alcohol die more rapidly than those who care less for it. Each generation, therefore, will be recruited more and more from the individuals who, being relatively immune to alcohol, have escaped the diseases which alcohol brings, and we ought to find a progressing indifference to alcohol among all people that have long been exposed to its influence. The further conclusion also follows: the greater the facilities for obtaining alcohol, the greater will be the mortality due to alcohol, the more stringent will be alcoholic selection in purging the race of individuals congenitally disposed to alcohol, and the freer will succeeding generations be from the craving for alcohol.

As in the case of zymotic disease, so in the case of alcohol, the facts appear to bear out the deduction in every respect.

'If the reader will call to mind all the races of the world of which he has a knowledge, he will find, as in the case of a prevalent and lethal disease, that every race is resistant (i.e. temperate) in the presence of alcohol in proportion to the length and severity of its past experience of the poison. There is no exception to this rule. Moreover, whenever we possess a sufficiently detailed and prolonged history of a race which is now temperate, we find that it was anciently drunken.'

The vine-producing countries of Southern Europe are the countries where alcohol has always been most abundant and accessible; and in these countries drunkenness is an exceedingly rare phenomenon. The Old Testament fulminates against the vice of drunkenness, showing that at one time it was very rampant among Jews. Yet now the sobriety of the race has

reached such a point that in London 'a drunken Jew—or 'Italian organ-grinder—is practically unknown.' Great Britain, which has long been intemperate, is gradually becoming purged of its more susceptible elements and settling down into a condition of sobriety. And the sobriety is least advanced among the poorest people, whose ancestors have in general had the least access to alcohol.

With opium, the same facts appear. Opium has been used in India for hundreds of years. 'So rarely do the natives of that country take it in excess that none of the scientific witnesses who appeared before the late Royal Commission 'on Opium had ever seen an instance.' But in Burma, Polynesia, and Australia, where it has been recently introduced, the natives take it in such excess as to die in large numbers of it: to such an extent, indeed, that their white rulers have been compelled to prohibit it altogether, while permitting it to Indians, Chinese, and other aliens whose ancestors have passed through the ordeal.

To complete the case, it only has to be added that there is little evidence that alcohol produces deterioration in the racial germ-plasm. If it does occasionally cause filial degeneration, the effect is far outweighed by the extinction of susceptible strains, leaving the race comparatively insusceptible. The law seems to be universal that hard conditions of life produce, not degeneration, but simply increased power to withstand those conditions.

Such is the view of human evolution which results from the theory that natural selection is the sole factor at work. The deduction is of great utility, in discovering to our examination the full implications in one direction of the theory advocated. We are bound to admit that the facts are such as to bear out the theory in every respect. Yet we are bound also to confess that we are far from convinced that there has been no other factor at work in organic evolution than that of natural selection. It is true that no one has been able to point out any other factor which can be proved to have significance. We believe that there are many biologists who support the all-sufficiency of natural selection from a feeling that the *fact* of evolution is in some way dependent upon an *explanation* of it. We have no such feeling. The *fact* of evolution rests on grounds as secure as any theory known to science. If no explanation of any sort were forthcoming, the fact of evolution would stand out patent to anyone who took the trouble to look into the evidence. Before natural selection was discovered, there was a distinguished

school of evolutionists in existence. They also conceived it necessary to a belief in their theory that a complete explanation must be supplied. Accordingly they pointed out how individuals became modified in contact with the environment; they alleged that these modifications were transmitted to offspring; and that this one factor was sufficient to account for evolution. It is now believed that, so far from being a sufficient explanation, the inheritance of acquired characters has had no effect whatever, and in fact does not occur. In later times these early evolutionists, having become acquainted with natural selection, wondered how they could have been so obsessed as to attribute the entire process to what they now realised was at the best a subordinate factor. There appears to be a danger of similar obsession now by natural selection. Darwin never claimed for his theory that it was all-sufficient. Even Weismann formulated a hypothesis for diminishing the haphazard character and direction of variations. So many persons have endeavoured to bolster up natural selection with a variety of other factors that there seems to be evidence of a general feeling that it is not alone an adequate explanation. Yet none of these other proposed factors bear a close scrutiny. There remains only one course—a course eminently scientific, yet often difficult even to men of science, and usually impossible to the uneducated public—to *confess our own ignorance*. It is wrong to be deterred from this confession by the certainty that ignorant people will rush into the gap with all sorts of supernatural or spiritualistic hypotheses and ready-made explanations. That is inevitable and must be borne. All the world over, it is looked on as sufficient proof of the most ridiculous theory, that no other has been formulated. No uninstructed person or race has ever confessed their own ignorance on matters where their sentiments or feelings are enlisted. The present instance can be no exception to the rule. But the explanations of the uninstructed have no chance in these times of attaining importance, unless indeed they should drive biologists to affirm their belief in some other theory with greater conviction than they actually feel. Biologists can always put forward hypotheses of far greater probability than the hypotheses of the ignorant, but it is not worth their while to do so. We may sum up then by saying that evolution has long passed the arena of discussion, that we are satisfied of the reality of natural selection and of its paramount importance as an explanation, but that we are not yet satisfied of its all-importance, that we consider no other suggested co-operating cause to have

been adequately proved, but that we look forward with confidence to further discoveries which will either establish the all-sufficiency of natural selection, or in conjunction with natural selection suffice to account for evolution.

From a consideration of the general aspects and results of heredity, we must now give some attention to its detailed and concrete manifestations. There are two wholly distinct methods of attacking the problem, each of which has been espoused by a distinct school of biologists. The one school is known as the Biometricians, and their method is the statistical method, which was originally applied to biological phenomena by Sir Francis Galton. Professor Karl Pearson and the late Professor Weldon were the main supporters of this school. They select some character for study, such as the length of the forceps of earwigs, and after measuring this character in an enormous number of specimens they embody the results in a curve which shows at a glance the extent and the character of the variations. The assumption underlying the method is that the only variations of any evolutionary significance are the minute fluctuating variations which are displayed by every living animal and plant. The other school, of which Professor Bateson is the chief English exponent, employ 'analytical' or Mendelian methods. They breed animals and plants during numerous generations for the purpose of tracing the inheritance of some particular character, and from a study of the individuals which do or do not inherit it they propound a theory of heredity to account for the facts. They hold, moreover, that fluctuations are of no evolutionary significance, and that the only variations which are perpetuated in the species are the large 'discontinuous' variations or 'mutations' which occur only rarely and at long intervals of time. The Biometricians and the Mendelians not only have opposed views, but hold each other in profound contempt. Their scientific discussions are of that amiable character to which we have been accustomed by temperance reformers holding forth on the subject of whisky, and by women suffragists discoursing on men. We have no intention of taking sides in this dispute. While we shall only discuss Mendelism in the present article, we must not be understood as sharing in the Mendelian opinion of biometry. On the contrary, the statistical method appears to us, not only to lead to results of the highest interest in themselves, but to be of great practical utility. We shall hope before long to deal more thoroughly in this Review with the statistical methods, but in the meanwhile we have only space to give a short account of Mendelism.

We do not propose, however, to go into the intricacies even of Mendelism. The details are often hard to follow, while the main principles are such as can be understood by anyone. We will first touch upon Dr. Berry Hart's book, 'Phases of Evolution and Heredity.' This work cannot, at all events, be accused of any narrow specialism of subject; for, starting with a criticism of the Mendelian theory, it wanders through a couple of essays on Bees, through 'votes for women,' to a chapter on 'men who have revealed themselves.' A doctor who travels into the domain of biology may add considerably to that science if he brings with him the true spirit of impartial and scientific inquiry. The value of Dr. Hart's book as a scientific work is somewhat discounted by the numerous *obiter dicta* of which he delivers himself by the way, catch-phrases for the most part, which would be received with joyful acclamation by the reading public, but are out of place in a serious text book of science. What, for instance, does Dr. Hart mean when he says 'Nature is right, as she always is'? To the average reader the statement will give a pang of satisfaction; the thought is agreeable, and therefore the question of its accuracy is not to be considered. Anybody who happens to have studied the foundations of ethics knows that right and wrong are relative to human beings, or at all events to living beings, only, and that when applied to 'Nature' the statement is meaningless. But supposing the statement to have some meaning, it would appear to us to be altogether untrue. If Nature is always right, why does Dr. Hart belong to a profession whose whole object is to interfere with the normal workings of Nature?

'What is true must stand—that is a law of nature.' Here is another statement of the same kind—a variation of *Magna est veritas, et praevalabit*—a statement appealing, not to the reader's intellect, but to his desire for a pleasurable sensation. If there is anything one particularly wants to believe, it is no doubt comforting to assure oneself emphatically that the thing in question is 'a law of nature.' This *obiter dictum* may be criticised in the same manner as the preceding—namely, that (1) it is meaningless; (2) if it had a meaning, it would be untrue.

Again, we do not believe for a moment that 'the legend of the Fall has undoubtedly entailed on women a crippled career in this world'; nor do we believe that sin is 'the heritage of the Æman of the Stone Age.' Dr. Hart panders to popular sentiment when he says that 'evolution teaches charity in judgement,' and also when he follows this up by the observation that 'the greatest lesson of evolution is hope.' Evolution

is a name given to a series of phenomena believed to have taken place ; so far as we can see, it has nothing to do with either hope or charity or any other moral lesson. These two virtues have surely a sufficiently secure basis of their own, without attempting to fortify them by grafting them on to scientific discoveries which are altogether irrelevant. The attempt is analogous to what happens when some man of superior intellectual distinction dies : all the newspapers laud up his moral character to the skies ; he is depicted as a saint of kindness and Sunday virtue, full of charity for the poor, &c.—in fact, as Mr. Bernard Shaw has well said, all endeavours are made to show him up as being of the ‘ philanthropic hosier ’ type ; his true greatness is forgotten, and he is praised for virtues he did not possess, but which the public are supposed to be most ready to admire. This is all very well for the daily newspapers, but is out of place in a work of science. Dr. Hart’s comments on Rousseau seem to us so exaggerated that we cannot help wondering whether he has ever read ‘ Les ‘Confessions.’ We often think that the shocked manner assumed by most Englishmen when Rousseau is mentioned must be due to the objectionable habit of reading expurgated translations, which leave the reader to suppose that his villainies and depravities were infinitely worse than they really were. In spite of these few defects Dr. Hart presents an interesting account of various biological theories.

On Mendelism, Professor Bateson’s book, ‘ Mendel’s Principles ‘of Heredity,’ is the standard work. The fundamental conception of Mendelians is that the individual is constituted of a large collection of unit-characters. The individual must be regarded as a sort of mosaic of characters, each character being a definite entity and liable to be altogether suppressed. Just as the individual is conceived as a bundle of ‘ characters,’ the germ-plasm is conceived as a bundle of ‘ factors ’ each of which gives rise to a ‘ character ’ in the adult which has sprung from it. Variation is conceived as due to the suppression of a character, or the sudden origin by mutation of a new character. Thus in Mendel’s original experiments on peas, tallness was one of the ‘ characters ’ considered, the absence of this character giving rise to shortness. Upon crossing a tall with a short variety of pea, the offspring in the first generation were all tall. In the second generation three-quarters of the individuals were tall, and the remaining quarter short. Breeding again from some of the tall individuals, three-quarters tall and one-quarter short turned up once more in the offspring. But the short individuals, whenever produced, breed indefinitely absolutely

true to shortness. The factor for tallness is altogether lost from their heredity. The characters of tallness and shortness, which are set in opposition to one another, are described as allelomorphs. When the factors of both are present in the germ-plasm of the individual, the individual presents only the character of tallness, that of shortness remaining latent. This is expressed by saying that tallness is dominant and shortness recessive; a tall plant, therefore, may be one in whose germ-plasm the factor of tallness alone is present: these plants will breed true. Or it may be one in which the factors both of tallness and shortness are present: these plants in the next generation will give rise to both tall and short individuals. A short plant, on the other hand, is one whose germ-plasm contains no factor for tallness at all; for if there were such a factor, tallness being dominant, the plant would be tall. Short plants therefore must breed true to the character of shortness.

Eye-colour in man has been alleged to follow Mendelian heredity. Brown or dark-coloured eyes are said to be dominant and blue or light-coloured eyes recessive. That is to say, blue eyes are due to the absence of the dark pigment which gives the colour to brown eyes*; and whenever the germ-plasm contains factors for both brown and blue eyes, the resulting individual will be brown-eyed. Thus there are two kinds of brown-eyed persons, those in whom the blue-eyed factor is absent, and those in whom it is present but recessive. Of blue-eyed persons there is only one kind, for no brown-eyed factor exists in their germ-plasm at all. According to this hypothesis, when a blue-eyed person marries another blue-eyed person the progeny must all have blue eyes. On the other hand, if a pure brown-eyed person (i.e. one in whom the blue-eyed factor is absent) marries a blue-eyed person, the progeny will all be brown-eyed, for brown is dominant over blue; but they will all contain the recessive blue-eyed character in a latent condition. If an impure brown-eyed person (i.e. one in whom the blue-eyed factor is latent) marries a blue-eyed person, the progeny will consist on the average, one half of blue-eyed persons, the other half of brown-eyed persons with recessive blue. For the gametes or sex-cells of impure brown-eyed persons are in equal numbers brown-eyed and blue-eyed; and it is therefore an even chance whether the blue-eyed gamete

* There is only a general and not a complete correspondence between the apparent eye-colour, and the presence or absence of pigment on the iris.

from the other individual meets with a brown-eyed or a blue-eyed gamete in the impure individual. It is supposed in all cases that one gamete can carry only one of the members of an allelomorphic pair.

An attempt has also been made to apply Mendelism towards an explanation of sexual dimorphism. Maleness (among vertebrates at least) is regarded as a recessive character, femaleness as a dominant character. That is to say, the gametes of the male would contain male factors exclusively, and carry no female factors whatever; while the gametes of the female would be evenly divided into male and female, the latter as the dominant character determining the sex of the bearer. All such hypotheses are of course only vague suggestions, and it would not be worth while to follow them further in this Review.

One of the most interesting spheres in which to apply the theory is in the case of Man. We have already alluded to the probable dominance of brown over blue eyes. Hair-colour appears to present a more intricate problem, and no conclusions have been reached, though Professor Bateson observes that red is presumably recessive. Various exceptional features, such as the Hapsburg lip, which have been traced through many generations, are supposed to be dominant characters. There seems to be no probability that the Mendelian law applies in the colour resulting from a cross between a negro and a European. The progeny are usually of intermediate colour; no segregation of the black and white factors can be observed. The mulattos, moreover, have in general been regarded as breeding true on the whole to their own colour, but this belief Professor Bateson will not admit without further data. At all events it is plain that Mendelian inheritance, if present at all, is very much obscured by other circumstances. Families composed of black and white which thenceforth breed true to these colours are not within the experience, and very much contrary to the preconceptions, of the average European dwelling among coloured races. Various diseases and malformations whose heredity has been investigated have been found to act as dominants to the normal characters; so that any individual who is free from the malformation may in these cases be assumed to be purely recessive and to have offspring without any fear of the re-appearance of the malformation. Human albinism is considered to be probably a recessive character. But unfortunately no law can be made out as to the heredity of most diseases, and especially of those whose heritable character is most widely recognised—the nervous diseases.*

Without adducing further instances, we may point out the

enormous practical importance which the Mendelian theory will possess if it withstands the effect of time and the constant stream of criticism that is directed against it. A 'character' or property of any animal or plant is a definite and individual thing, which may be dealt with by rational breeding, and with the greatest ease either perpetuated for ever in the race or extinguished with no chance of its return. Very different is this view from that which we received from the earlier biologists. We were nearly all of us brought up in the belief that a chance character could only be rendered permanent in a species after prolonged and uninterrupted selection, lasting over many generations, of all individuals who showed any tendency towards the desired character. Even then the character produced showed little signs of permanence when selection ceased. Domestic races of pigeons are always ready to revert to the characters of the ancestral rock-pigeon, if left to go wild. The Mendelian theory holds out promise of far simpler methods. According to it, a character may be fixed for ever and its allelomorph excluded for ever in a race by rational breeding *in a single generation*. The germ-plasm is deprived altogether of the undesirable quality; so that, without its re-introduction by future cross-breeding, it never can occur again. A vital or physiological character is an indissoluble unit that can be transferred or abolished or combined with other characters of other races at the pleasure of the enlightened breeder. No suggestion, of course, is made for the creation of new characters: but it is affirmed, or suggested, or hinted, that we may build up a new race of individuals by looking round and deciding which of the special characters already existing in many different varieties are the most desirable; these characters may then be combined, characters considered undesirable may be excluded, and the new race produced will of necessity breed absolutely true to its newly-colligated characters.

If the theory can be made good, it is obviously fraught with most momentous consequences for mankind. The school of eugenics has for long endeavoured to instil into the public mind some of the practical applications of biology to the human species, and its efforts have at length met with some success. It is pointed out that the quality of the germ-plasm, and therefore of the race, is a function almost exclusively of heredity and not of environment. It is proposed therefore to improve the human species by two methods: by inaugurating a system of selection which will ascertain what individuals have the best heredity, and bring them into contact with a view to marriage; and by forbidding procreation altogether to those who fail to reach a

certain standard of hereditary qualities. If the Mendelian theory is found to be at all extensively applicable to the human species, an instrument of unparalleled efficiency and power is placed in the hands of the human breeder.

Let us consider for a moment the two propositions of eugenics. Supposing it to be true that, by breeding from the best individuals, the stock may be improved, it is clear that such improvement can only be effected at the expense of that portion of the stock which is left. The effect of the measure is twofold : by taking from the common germ-plasm all that is best, and segregating it from the rest to prevent its future contamination, we at the same time cause a corresponding deterioration in the unselected germ-plasm which combines all the worst qualities of the race. The race would be divided into two heterogeneous halves. It is of course the idea of eugenics that the deteriorated half would soon die out, and that the race would then consist of the superior half alone. This makes their first proposition equivalent to their second :—viz. that the quality of the race should be conserved by elimination of all unfavourable elements. We shall here waive altogether the practicability of ordinances against marriages of the unfit, or of the stronger measure of inflicting upon them disablement by surgical means. We are interested only in the philosophical desirability of such measures. Arguments from analogy offer strong support ; evolution, we know, uses natural selection as its instrument, an instrument which inexorably cuts off all who fail to pass its standard. Natural selection, it is said, is largely in abeyance for human beings ; we must therefore substitute human selection. The argument is very plausible ; but the question at once arises what types we are to eliminate. The answer usually comes prompt : surely no one can object to the elimination of the feeble-minded, of maniacs, of epileptics, of rachitics, of monstrosities.* To prevent such persons from breeding appears to be so obviously desirable on philosophic grounds, that apparently few can be found to question it. Nevertheless we are here about to question it : not, be it noted, because we are prepared to affirm our disbelief in it, but because we do not consider that it possesses that character of absolute certainty which alone would justify fiddle-faddling with the human germ-plasm. We must remember that a quality once bred out of existence can never by any possible measure be recovered, and that if some

* As typical of the views of eugenists, we have taken Professor Richet's interesting book, '*La Sélection Humaine*,' recently published in France.

extinguished character were afterwards found to have correlated with it some other unperceived character of great or vital advantage, that character could never again be acquired by humanity. But of what possible use can the epileptic or microcephalic idiot be ? asks the enthusiast. A great deal, we answer. Some of the greatest transformations in the world were wrought by persons suffering from such diseases. Julius Caesar and Mahomed were epileptics ; so also very probably were Napoleon Buonaparte, Alexander the Great, and St. Paul. If eugenics had been in force throughout the ages, some of the greatest names of history would have been lost, and the progress of the world inconceivably altered. Among writers the association of genius with disease is often noted. Rousseau was a nervous 'degenerate' ; and the French Revolution was largely engineered by diseased persons, such as Marat, Robespierre, Couthon. Comte and many other philosophers have been insane. Schumann, Nietzsche, and Guy de Maupassant were the victims of a vile disease, culminating in general paralysis and insanity. Tuberculosis wrought its effects on Chopin, Rachel, Heine, Robert Louis Stevenson, and John Stuart Mill. Religious paranoia is often associated with sexual aberrations. Need we say more ? If the heredity of these famous men had been examined by an enlightened eugenicist, and their birth been at his mercy, how many of them, we should like to know, would have been allowed to be born ? Lombroso even affirmed that genius and degeneracy were closely related. Max Nordau advocated a similar view. Their views are at a discount at present (rightly so, we think, in the main) ; yet there seems some evidence that inherited disease, especially inherited nervous disease, acts as an irritant or in some other way, which stimulates throughout life an unnatural cerebral activity. Charles Lamb, on the other hand, held that there was a special association between genius and sanity. In his essay on the 'Sanity of True Genius' he asks if it is possible to think of a mad Shakespeare. We find no particular difficulty in believing that Shakespeare may at times have suffered from such a form of insanity as melancholia. If we may trust (which, however, we do not) Mr. Frank Harris's ingenious and interesting delineation of Shakespeare, he was a man who may very probably have suffered from a tainted heredity. His relations with Mary Fitton are not characteristic of a man with a well-balanced mind. But in many cases, the morbid mental working is plain to the least observant. Who can read Edgar Allan Poe without discerning that his uneasy genius is founded in nervous disorder ? Will any eugenicist declare, after due examination of these facts,

that it is safe to eradicate the root of nervous disease from the germ-plasm of the race? As the environing conditions of humanity improve, the irritant effects of a nervous taint ever have a better chance of being utilised for healthy purposes rather than breaking out in direct disease. Recognising to the full the ghastly horrors implied by a nervous taint, we are yet very far from being convinced that there is no chance of the victims carrying obscure advantages of immense value to humanity. At all events, until science reaches the point at which it can see all through and round the whole subject, it appears to us unwise to meddle, even with a high degree of probability in our favour. We have already pointed out that much of the evils of life are brought on by officious persons, who must always be busying themselves about something, and who are physically incapable of leaving anything alone. Herbert Spencer long ago pointed out this human failing. If a man slips and falls on the pavement, the bystanders rush to pick him up, never pausing to reflect that there can be no harm in letting him lie, while there may be serious injury inflicted in hastily pulling him up. A large proportion of the people have more physical energy than can be controlled by their intelligence (to their credit be it said that their energy is often dictated by the warmest and kindest feelings): in some persons energy is exuded at every pore, and if ill-directed the danger from their well-meant efforts is great. For such people the poor are a godsend; what would they do if there were no unfortunates to attend to? Politics drafts off the superfluous energy of many in a fairly harmless, often beneficial, direction. They advocate sundry schemes of social reform, they shout for socialism, or for individualism as the case may be; they form political associations, speak at street-corners, attend committees. Others again go out and convert the Chinese to Christianity, or go round collecting money for hospitals; they also form associations, attend committees, get up dinners, rush about from place to place, and in general thoroughly enjoy themselves and get rid of their superfluous energy in ways more or less harmless or beneficial. Many rush into some business undertaking and become bankrupt; or, if their energy drops into a happy line, may make their fortunes. The national health is perhaps to some extent dependent on the existence of adequate channels for drafting off the activities of its citizens. Here, we consider, lies the chief danger of eugenics. When the biological theories upon which it rests have come home to the public, as they are very rapidly doing, there are certain to be a large number of energetic over-sanguine people who, deservng with joy this

promising opportunity of doing something big, and especially something that comes forward under the august patronage of science, will proceed to experiment vigorously before scientific knowledge is really ripe for application. Such premature action might be fatal. The officiousness which results in the placing of a number of bad laws on the Statute Book does only temporary harm ; the officiousness of the statesman who plunges his country into a needless war, bringing death to thousands and misery to thousands more, is all forgotten in a generation, with no permanent harm done ; but the officiousness of the 'scientific reformer' who flings the racial germ-plasm into the mud of political controversy, to be canvassed and fought over by wallowing politicians, may be working damage that can never again be retrieved throughout the future history of the world

ART. V.—EUROPEAN DOMINION IN ASIA.

1. *Ancient and Modern Imperialism.* By the EARL OF CROMER. London: John Murray. 1910.
2. *Trois Ans en Perse.* Par le COMTE DE GOBINEAU. Paris. 1858.
3. *The Prince of Destiny.* By SARATH KUMAR GHOSE. London: Rebman, Limited. 1909.
4. *Hindupore.* By S. M. MITRA. London: Luzac & Co. 1909.

THE political relations between Europe and Asia since authentic history began have undergone many striking and important vicissitudes. In the record of the wars, invasions, and territorial conquests up to and for some centuries after the Christian era the balance of advantages was entirely on the side of Europe. When the Persian kings invaded Europe in the fifth century B.C. the frontiers of the Western continent were so gallantly defended by the Greek States that the Asiatic forces were defeated by sea and land. In the fourth century Europe invaded Asia, when Alexander led his Macedonians from the Bosphorus to the Punjab rivers, and founded a vast dominion that was held by his successors until the Romans took over charge of Western Asia. But in the seventh century of our era the rise and rapid spread of Islam turned the scale for the first time in favour of Asia; and during the centuries that followed Christianity and European dominion were both swept out of the eastern continent. The Arabs established a dominion in Spain, in Italy, and invaded France, and later the Osmanli empire fixed itself in South-eastern Europe, where it still clings to Constantinople and to some relics of its former territory. From the seventeenth century, however, the tide of conquest began again to flow Eastward; and by the nineteenth century England and Russia had consolidated great dominions in Asiatic lands. This swaying to and fro of the long contest for superiority between Europe and Asia, the ebb and flow of the tide of territorial conquest, present a wide and attractive field of historical survey; though it is doubtful whether a connected view of the subject has ever been undertaken. Yet the periods of early European dominion in Asia, Greek and Roman, may be studied with profit and to much practical purpose by the nation that at this moment finds itself in charge of India. The influence of Western civilisation upon the destinies of Asiatic countries, the effect of orderly government, of intellectual emancipation, of the close interconnexion between the two

continents, were in former times very powerful, and are now again rapidly extending. Moreover the various points of comparison, the curious resemblance of administrative methods and political expedients adopted by European rulers in different ages and in similar circumstances, suggest remarkable analogies to an Englishman who is familiar with the same problems as those that confronted the Greeks and the Romans in Asia.

Mr. Bevan, indeed, in his valuable 'History of the House of 'Seleucus,' regards the Macedonian empire in Western Asia as in some respects the prototype of the British empire in India. The book is written with an admirable breadth of view, and the passages in which he draws attention to certain points of comparison between the earliest and the latest European dominions in the East touch a note that stirs the historical imagination. He writes, for example, in his opening chapter :

'There is one particular part of the activity of Western civilisation since the Renaissance which lends its principal interest to the history of the Macedonian kings in the East—the extension of European rule in the East of to-day. It was a consequence of the smallness of the ancient free State that it could not compete with the great monarchies of the world in military power. But this limitation has been done away ; and as a result the States of Western culture have risen to a position of immeasurable military superiority. This is one of the capital features of modern history. . . . To-day an enormous part of the East is under the direct government of Europeans ; all of it is probably destined (unless it can assimilate the dominant civilisation, as the Japanese appear to have done) to be so at no distant date. We may say, then, with perfect truth that the work being done by European nations, and especially by England, in the East is the same work which was begun by Macedonia at Rome, and undone by the barbarian floods of the Middle Ages. The civilisation which perished in India with the extinction of the Greek kings has come back again in the British officials. What will the effect be ? An experiment of enthralling interest is being tried before our eyes. Those who predict its issue by some easy commonplace about the eternal distinction of " East " and " West " have given inadequate consideration to the history of East and West . . . Whatever the issue may be, a peculiar interest must be felt by Englishmen in those Western kings who ruled in Asia twenty centuries ago.' *

We may accept with due modesty Mr. Bevan's view that the British empire in India may be regarded as the revival of the civilisation imported into Asia by the Greeks, which stamped its impression for centuries upon the lands which it overspread.

* Vol. i. p. 19.

Nevertheless this passage contains two propositions with which one may hesitate to agree. In the first place, he takes the immeasurable military superiority of the West to be one of the capital features of modern history. Yet it is equally true that the superiority of the Western races in war was a capital feature of ancient history. We know from Herodotus that the Greeks thought very little of the soldiers of the Persian king; they are called 'barbarians who engage in battle wearing loose 'trousers, with turbans on their heads, easy to overcome'; though he admits that at Marathon the Greek centre was completely broken by the Persians. Xenophon's story of the retreat of the Ten Thousand Greeks from the Euphrates, and, above all, Alexander's marvellous victories, prove that Eastern troops were no match for the disciplined forces of the West. In fact, the Greek and Macedonian armies, and after them the Roman legions, until the empire came into collision with Parthia, seem to have dispersed Oriental armies and to have beat down the old Asiatic monarchies as easily as Russia and England did in Central Asia and in India during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. But the rise of Islam turned for a time the fortunes of war. We are told by contemporary writers that in the sixteenth century the Turkish armies were too strong for the European; and in our own day we have had a good reason for doubting whether superiority in arms will always be found decidedly on the side of the West. At any rate, we have recently had ample warning that for Europe the era of facile victories in Asia has ended.

Secondly, Mr. Bevan discards as 'an easy commonplace' the belief in an eternal distinction between East and West. On such a far-reaching question no one can pretend to a positive opinion, or can predict what may happen in the distant future; but the evidence of past history does give manifest support to the belief that this distinction is real, inveterate, that it goes very deep. It is undeniable that no European civilisation, Greek, Roman, or English, has ever yet taken permanent root in Asiatic soil, or has obliterated the ingrained prejudices of race and religion; it is certain that European dominion has never yet thoroughly changed the habits or the character of an Asiatic people. The civil polity of Rome has stamped an indelible impress on the language, literature, and laws of Europe, but it has left hardly a trace, beyond ruins and the shadow of a mighty name (Rome), throughout all the Asiatic lands which it once overspread from the Euphrates river westward to the Mediterranean shores. Relics of Greek architecture and art, and a few grains of Greek learning and philosophy, may still be

found scattered about Western Asia, but the Hellenic culture and institutions have vanished utterly. And the cardinal question before the English in India at the present moment is whether the foundation of our own civilisation can be so firmly laid as to withstand the natural forces that make for reversion to the original type—whether its ideas and institutions can be effectively assimilated by a great and infinitely diversified population. There is no doubt that the results of Alexander's conquests, and of the empire consolidated in Western Asia by his successors, were mighty and manifold; 'the strength of his empire,' according to Finlay, 'was based on the political principle of amalgamating his subjects into one people by permanent institutions,' and thus infusing into them some elements of the Hellenic character.* Yet Finlay observes, in the same chapter, that the mixture of Macedonians, Greeks, and natives in the conquered countries was very incomplete—that they generally formed distinct classes in society; † and although Alexander's wise policy of amalgamating his Eastern subjects into one people by liberal civil institutions does not seem to have been abandoned by his successors, the general result, according to this historian, was rather to lower the European than to elevate the Asiatic. 'During two hundred and fifty years,' he says, 'the Greeks were the dominant classes in Asia, and the corrupting influence of their predominance was extended to the whole frame of society, in their European as well as in their Asiatic possessions.' Of demoralisation among the Romans, after their Asiatic conquests, Finlay draws a much darker picture, declaring that it far exceeded the corruption of the Greeks.

‡ This, then, is said to be the effect of the vast inflow of wealth into Europe that followed the acquisition by Rome of a great dominion in Asia. But after the removal of the capital to Constantinople even the sources of material prosperity appear to have been diverted from the West. We are told by Finlay that the European provinces of the empire, weakened by misrule and over-taxation, were rapidly devastated and depopulated by the barbarian invasions, that their wealth was exhausted and their cities decayed; while all the Eastern commerce fell into the hands of the Greek cities in Syria, Egypt, and Asia Minor, which became the principal emporia of trade with the further East, rich, thriving, and luxurious. 'In the general disorder which reigned over Western Europe, the only depots for merchandise that

* Greece under the Romans, chap. i. p. 3.

† P. 13.

'could be found in security were in the Eastern empire ;'* and, later, 'the commerce of the countries to the north of the Black Sea, the fur and Indian trade by the Caspian, the Oxus, and the Indus, centred in Constantinople.'† In short, it was Asia, not Europe, that was enriched by the conquests of the Roman empire in the East.

Let us now turn to another authority—Comte de Gobineau—a Frenchman who resided and travelled in Asia, who represented his country at Teheran some fifty years ago, and who has written books full of original and shrewd observation upon Asiatic character and manners. In his book, '*Trois Ans en Perse*,' he devoted a remarkable chapter to the probable results of the relations between Europe and Asia—to the question, that is, whether the Asiatics may be expected to accept modern civilisation. His reply may be given in his own words :

'J'ai beau regarder, je ne m'aperçois pas qu'on ait obtenu jusqu'ici aucun résultat de ce genre ni dans les temps modernes ni dans les temps anciens. En ce qui concerne le passé, les Grecs et les Romains n'ont jamais civilisé personne.'

Moreover, in regard to the consequences of the intermixture in ancient times between Europeans and Asiatics, the view of Gobineau is identical with that of Finlay. He affirms that after Alexander's conquests in Asia the Greeks lost all their moral and intellectual qualities by a rapid decline, so that when the Romans took over Western Asia from the Greeks, they contracted a corrupting infection which was fatal to them. And he goes on to declare that what he calls 'these marriages' between Europe and Asia not only damaged Rome and Greece intellectually and morally, but also impoverished the conquerors. The result of conferring peace and good government on the Asiatic provinces and of stimulating their immense productive capacities was, he says, that the financial capital of Europe was gradually drawn into Asia, that great commercial cities arose on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, and that the vast profits of the trade between the two continents passed into Asiatic hands. This prosperity ended, of course, with the destruction of the Byzantine empire by the Turks, who laid waste all those flourishing regions, cut off the land routes and waterways which had made Constantinople a commercial centre, and left Asia Minor desolate. But the point for notice here is Gobineau's prediction that the reappearance of European dominion in Asia in our own time will eventually produce a similar result, that with the revival of peace and industrial security the drain

* P. 201.

† P. 317.

of capital eastward will again set in, and that the European will discover that he is enriching the Asiatic at a heavy loss to himself. Already, he observes, at Calcutta, Bombay, and Canton the native merchants are prospering at the expense of the foreigner, whom they are likely to oust before long; while he prophesies that the produce and manufactures of Asia will seriously affect European industries whenever the methods and machinery of the West shall have been imported into Eastern countries. He believes that the state of commercial exchanges, whereby England has managed (he says) to secure a considerable balance in her favour, is artificial, and cannot possibly last long; and it cannot be denied that since Gobineau wrote an ingenious manipulation of the exchanges has been found necessary. It must be at least admitted that the course and tendency of affairs, political and economical, during the fifty years since his book was published have been on the whole in accord with his prediction.

Yet although Gobineau found nothing to warrant the expectation that Western civilisation will absorb and assimilate Asiatic peoples, would transform their character and eradicate inveterate differences, he did not deny the possibility that, on the assumption of irresistible military superiority, a European nation might successfully maintain a great dominion on the Eastern continent. But he knows only two systems by which this can be done. For an example of the first he takes the *régime* under which at the time when he wrote the English were governing India, keeping themselves distinct, apart from the native population, and allotting to the Indians no more than a limited and subaltern share in the administration. It is a lofty conception of rulership, he agrees, and good so long as it can be upheld; but he observes that under such a system the subjects will grow restless, impatient of their inferiority, and disposed to take advantage of any opportunity of challenging the predominance of the foreigners. 'Pour le 'maintenir il faut constamment être fort, toujours fort habile'; and if some day weakness or blunders were to break it down, the government might collapse and be followed by general anarchy.

The alternative system is described by Gobineau as that which was adopted by Alexander and his Macedonian successors in Asia, and by the Romans after them. Its essential principle consists, we are told, in admitting the native population to co-operate with the ruling race in the government of their country, in admitting them to a substantial share in the public services, conciliating by every means their interests and

self-respect, and endeavouring by every practical method to promote a fusion that may weld the two races into a united people. The process will be slow, there will be risks to be faced, and the period of transition from the autocratic to the liberal *régime* is full of hazards :

‘ Les indigènes ne sont pas encore apprivoisés, et cependant ils ont souvent à leur disposition bien des moyens de nuire. Ils sont à la fois dignitaires des conquérants et sollicités par le patriotisme local. Le haut rang qu’on leur a donné ou reconnu, en augmentant leur influence, les peut exciter singulièrement à des ambitions supérieures, et telles que l’affranchissement seul saurait y satisfaire.’

Nevertheless Gobineau agrees that these difficulties and dangers may be surmounted by administrative ability and statesmanship ; that in such situations to gain time is to gain almost everything, and that the examples of the Seleucid and the Roman empires in Asia in the past go far to prove that under this system a Western dominion in Oriental lands may endure for centuries. But let it be supposed, he proceeds, that some amalgamation of the European and Asiatic races is thereby eventually brought about, what will be the result ? His answer is that according to all preceding historical experience the consequences, moral, economic and social, will be detrimental to the European. To the subject of inter-marriages he makes only a very brief reference, passing it over with the remark that no one has a good word for them :

Our general conclusion, therefore, from the writings and opinions of those who have studied the earlier periods of European domination in the East, may be that the rule of the Macedonian, the Roman, and the Byzantine Greek, while they lasted, was each of them in a very high degree beneficial to Asia. According to Finlay :

‘ The influence of Alexander’s philanthropic policy survived the kingdoms which his arms had founded, and tempered the despotism of the Romans by its superior influence over society ; nor was it utterly effaced in Asia until Mahomet changed the government, the religion, and the frame of society in the East.’*

Let us now look on the other side of the question. It is not possible to contend that the establishment of Asiatic dominion in Europe by the Mahommedans has at any time been advantageous to European civilisation, except perhaps in the instance of the conquest of Spain early in the eighth century by the

* Vol. i. p. 4.

Arabs and Moors, who long maintained there a government upon a level of toleration and general culture that may be favourably compared with the feudal barbarism and bigoted superstition which prevailed in other European countries during the Middle Ages. The Osmanli Turks finally destroyed the Greek empire at Constantinople in the fifteenth century, just at the period when the clouds of medieval obscurity were retreating before the growing light of the Renaissance; they afterwards overran South-Eastern Europe, and founded the empire which yet survives; but the consequence of their rule has been to degrade the subject Christian population, and to extinguish for centuries intellectual progress and political emancipation. Asiatic conquests in Western countries have done far more harm than good to Europe: on a comparison of benefits to the world's civilisation the balance of advantage is entirely on the side of the Eastern continent.

Lord Cromer's '*Essay on Ancient and Modern Imperialism*' is an admirable and important contribution to the discussion of the main questions with which we endeavour to deal very briefly in this article, and with which the English, of all nations, are principally concerned. After reviewing the salient characteristics of ancient Imperialism, its character, its difficulties, and its defects, he turns to the situation of modern empires founded and ruled after the ancient fashion and under similar conditions—of empires, that is to say, which have been built up on a wide territorial scale, by the subordination of various races to a sovereignty that has been won and maintained by superiority in civilization and the force of disciplined armies, and which have hitherto been of necessity governed autocratically. There is, as Lord Cromer has observed, no analogy between the administration of the Roman provinces and the Imperial relations of Great Britain with the self-governing colonies. This is sufficiently obvious; but it is important to point out that all parallels or precedents drawn from the Roman empire in Europe are equally inadmissible; and that if we undertake to compare ancient with modern Imperialism, the only true parallel of conditions and circumstances is to be found in the history of European dominion, ancient and modern, in Asia.

This comparison, indeed, has often been suggested, notably in the very able essay at the beginning of Mr. Bryce's '*Studies in History and Jurisprudence*.' Lord Cromer, like Count de Gobineau and Mr. Finlay, has taken up his subject with the great advantage of personal experience obtained from residence in Oriental countries, and from long acquaintance

with Eastern people and politics. And the great reputation that he has won by his tenure, during over twenty years, of high office in Egypt may be regarded as corroborating an observation quoted in his essay from another writer—that ‘one of the ‘secrets of the better administration of Caesar’s provinces was ‘the length of time during which one of his legates might be ‘kept in a single province’; for Lord Cromer himself has been for some twenty-five years a notable successor of Caesar’s legates in Egypt, though his position and powers were not exactly similar. The conclusions of such an authority are therefore entitled to very serious consideration, and in proceeding to criticise some points in his statement of them we are mainly endeavouring to place the true analogy between ancient and modern Imperialism quite clearly before our readers.

‘If,’ Lord Cromer says, ‘we turn to the comparative results obtained by ancient and modern Imperialists, if we ask ourselves whether the Romans, with their imperfect means of locomotion and communication, their relatively low standard of public morality, and their ignorance of many economic and political truths . . . succeeded as well as any modern people in assimilating the nations which the prowess of their arms had brought under their sway, the answer cannot be doubtful. They succeeded far better. It is true that in the East they did so at the cost of their national individuality. In that quarter they conquered the world only to give it to Hellas, but in the West they left their own abiding mark on the destinies of mankind. They either Romanised the races who were at first their subjects, or left those races to be the willing agents of their own Romanisation.’*

That Roman Imperialism was thoroughly successful in Europe, and that its effects have survived up to our own time, is a manifestly incontestable fact; the assimilation of the Western nations was complete, and their amalgamation under the Empire was cemented by the triumph of Christianity. But in estimating the comparative results of ancient and modern Imperialism it is necessary, we submit, to strike out of the account the success of the Romans in the West, and to consider only their Asiatic dominion, because modern European Imperialism, in the ancient signification of the term, has been exclusively confined to Asiatic countries. The real question is how far the Roman dominion succeeded in the East; for this is the only point in the comparison that interests modern nations. In a footnote to the passage quoted above from

his book, Lord Cromer gives a reference to a passage in the 'Studies of Roman Imperialism,' by W. Arnold, where Arnold tells us that in the attempt to impose the Latin language on the Greek East, the great Imperial State failed, 'though she succeeded in Gaul, Spain and even in Africa'; and that 'the empire of the East was absorbed and drowned in Hellenism.' But Arnold adds that 'the fundamental dualism of East and West, which had been asserted by Mithradates and again by Antony, was never really overcome.' We therefore submit that on this main issue—the amalgamation of East and West under an European empire—the right induction from all the authorities cited must be that Roman Imperialism was not remarkably or permanently successful in assimilating the conquered nations of Asia; though it was eminently serviceable by reason of the powerful protection which the Empire afforded to Hellenism during three important centuries, until the Greek civilisation that had been implanted in Asiatic lands found a new centre by the establishment of an Eastern empire at Constantinople. Moreover, it is important to remark for the purpose of our comparison, that the deep and lasting impress stamped on the East by Roman and Greek domination was the effect of a continuous occupation during more than a thousand years, whereas the civilising work of modern Imperialism in Asia may be affirmed to have only just begun—in India it was only taken up in earnest after the sepoy mutiny of 1857. According to Lord Cromer it is very generally held that 'the inability of modern European races to assimilate subject races . . . is especially marked in the case of the British'; but one may fairly rejoin that the modern experiment is on its trial, has indeed only begun quite recently: that no result could be expected so soon; and that in the first years of the Roman empire an able pro-consul might very reasonably have convinced himself that his nation was decidedly unsuccessful in Asia. In the western continent the assimilation of races brought under the Roman sovereignty was natural and easy: it was favoured by conditions and circumstances; by the absence of religious antagonism and by a certain general affinity of the European population. In the East the problem was always quite different, and its difficulties have materially increased in modern times. In one respect the comparison between the territorial conquests, ancient and modern, holds good; they were made under similar conditions—of military superiority and civilised intelligence enabling European armies to upset weak Asiatic despotisms, and to subdue populations that had been always accustomed to transfer their allegiance

to the winner of battles. The countries through which Alexander marched from the Mediterranean to the Indus were mostly in this unstable and incoherent state, under effete dynasties or tribal chiefs; and when the English advanced in the course of a century from the sea to the Indus two thousand years afterward, their success in war was due to the same advantages, for the political organisation which their dominion superseded was of a particularly flimsy character.

There is no need to carry farther the historical analogies, if enough has been said to justify us in regarding the British empire in India as representing the third experiment in Asiatic Imperialism, undertaken by an European nation whose dominion implies the promise and policy of a higher civilisation. For the Russians, though they have annexed to their European territories a vast region in Asia, have yet hardly advanced beyond the stage of pacifying their barbarous subjects, and according to M. Vambéry their own culture, moral and political, is incomplete at home. The French have only occupied certain countries on the southern coasts, where the European is certainly on no better footing with the natives than in India; and Java, under the cautious and commercial administration of the Dutch, is an island which cannot rank with the empires of the Asiatic mainland.

The history of the British constitution shows that our nation, which has from time to time made original discoveries in the domain of science, has also led the way in the field of practical politics. Representative institutions, parliamentary control, limited monarchy may be said to have been invented and developed within this island; they have served as the patterns on which Europe and America have reformed their own machinery of government, sometimes with indifferent success. And now we find ourselves once more at the head of a political adventure; we have to act as pioneers in a region hitherto unexplored, while other western nations look on with not wholly benevolent curiosity at our attempts to solve the problems of modern Imperialism. The British rulers of India are reviving, as Mr. Bevan has said, the policy of the great Macedonian conqueror; they are endeavouring to consolidate their Oriental empire upon a foundation of liberal institutions. What, one may ask, are the materials for building up on this basis a fabric whose construction will certainly test, if it is to be sound and durable, the inventive genius of the most skilful and experienced political architect?

Mr. James Bryce, in those 'Studies in History and Jurisprudence' that prove his intimate acquaintance with both sciences

has a * dissertation of some length on the art of adapting Constitutions to the conditions and needs of various communities. One principal object of a Constitution is, he observes, to hold the State together, not only to prevent its disruption by the revolt or secession of a part of the nation, but to strengthen the cohesiveness of the country by creating good machinery for connecting the outlying parts with the centre, and by appealing to every motive of interest and sentiment that can lead all sections of the inhabitants to desire to remain united under one Government.† And he proceeds to enumerate the 'centripetal and centrifugal forces' (to use his expression) that have been found to advance or retard the accomplishment of national unity, particularly the tendencies to disruption that may oppose or even defeat amalgamation under one State. Upon the obstacles presented by differences of race, religion, and language he lays ample stress, yet he considers that these disruptive forces may be gradually overcome by the skilful adaptation to circumstances of constitutional methods, and that where religion and language have ceased to divide a population, social intercourse and inter-marriage operate effectively towards promoting a fusion.

'But,' he adds

'in one set of cases no fusion is possible, and this set forms the despair of the statesman; it presents a problem which no Constitution has yet solved. It is the juxtaposition on the same soil of races of different colour.'

This, Mr. Bryce tells us, is a recent phenomenon in history; for he finds that under the Roman empire prejudices of colour were not strong enough to prevent social intercourse, inter-marriage, or equal access to high offices of State among the Italians and Hellenised Asiatics. But unfortunately this single problem, which no Constitution has yet solved, is just that which confronts the British statesmen who are endeavouring gradually and tentatively to introduce the elements of constitutional government into India. It may therefore be taken as the case upon which the possibilities of modern Imperialism in Asia are to be tested in circumstances particularly unfavourable. Yet, as the trial of this case only began in the last century, there is still hope for a successful outcome, and certainly British statesmen have no intention of abandoning the enterprise in despair. We have to bear in mind that many of the attractive forces

* Vol. i. chapters iii., iv.

† Chap. iv. p. 273.

and influences which, according to Mr. Bryce, draw together under one State diverse races, and counteract the centrifugal and disruptive tendencies, are already operating powerfully towards cementing the relation between Great Britain and India. Among these binding forces the material interests are always very strong: the spread of industry, the security of property, the national wealth increased on both sides by a prosperous commerce; light customs duties; safe, easy, and swift intercommunication; the introduction of good laws and the administration of justice; the devolution of representative self-government by the establishment of local legislatures—all these advantages and solid benefits have accrued to India from the British connexion, and on that connexion they all depend for their permanency. The last sixty years have been a period of administrative construction by legal and even constitutional reforms, which are slowly moulding the intelligence of the people to a habitual conception of government by impartial and systematic procedure; and the visible changes made in all classes of the population by the firm and regular enforcement of law, is a fact of great value to political philosophy, as evidence among other things of the power which good legislation can exert over morals. We have supplied India liberally with capital at a low interest, thereby enabling her Government to construct what is perhaps the greatest irrigation system in the world, and to lay out through the country railways, which have become the prime instruments of economical progress and of intercourse among provinces formerly separate and remote. That the national prosperity and welfare of India are due to its association with the British empire, and depend on the continuance of those relations, will be questioned by no one with a real knowledge of, and an impartial judgement upon, her past and present condition.

But the conception of government as chiefly if not exclusively concerned with the duties of developing economic resources, of providing for police, legislation, and the distribution of local authority—though these are unquestionably matters of essential importance—has never satisfied those who desire to draw fast and firm the bonds of empire. It is upon moral and intellectual sympathies that the statesman relies, upon a community of ideas, sentiments, and tastes, upon freedom of thought, liberty of speech, and all the mental training and enlightenment, the social elevation, that education in its widest and highest sense is expected to confer upon a people naturally endowed with very potent intellectual capacities. The Hindus, who form

the great majority, have indeed transcended, in the sphere of abstract speculation, all other Asiatic nations ; they have also the gift of rapid apprehension ; they seize and assimilate new ideas, new views of life. The ingrained prejudices of caste and custom still chain down the multitude ; yet these barriers can be either set up or set aside by the dominant classes on emergency, or for some positive advantage, or can be accommodated to altered habits of life. The Mahomedans are distinguished by qualities formed to a large degree upon their religious and historical traditions ; they are in communion with a Faith that has spread over all Western Asia, that has founded empires and dynasties which have played a great part in the world's drama ; their political instinct is steady and practical, they have the strength of a united minority, preserving the traditions of rulership and of prowess in war. Within these two main divisions, if we include a few primitive tribes of the hills and the wolds, may be ranked the whole population of India.

It was not until the mutiny of the sepoy in 1857, that final outbreak of ignorance and superstition, had been suppressed, that the British government seriously realised the urgent necessity of eradicating barbarism by the civilising influences of education. We are well aware that the first steps which inaugurated this policy had been taken in 1835, when the Government, yielding to the forcible arguments of Macaulay, who was then in India, decided that the higher education, so far as it was State-aided, should be given in the learning and language of the West, and almost simultaneously withdrew all restrictions upon Indian journalism. To the ulterior consequences of these far-reaching innovations he was not blind ; he admitted that instruction in European knowledge and the habit of political discussion might 'in some future age' produce a demand for European institutions. But such remote possibilities he was ready to accept, and he evidently believed that the transition from the old to the new order of ideas would be tranquil and orderly. On the educational point immediately at issue in 1835 Macaulay was on the whole right, and the Orientalists who opposed him were wrong ; yet the change was too abrupt and uncompromising : it provoked sure resentment and patriotic protest, especially among the Mahomedans, whose literature is so closely connected with their religion. For Macaulay, with all his genius, often lacked full sympathy with the deeper and more delicate sensibilities of race and religion ; his mind could not tolerate what he thought indisputably irrational. That a prejudice might exist among the people

of India against excluding their ancient literature and language from the superior courses of public instruction did not strike him as a matter for serious consideration. But the grievance that the national literature has been neglected under British rule has since that time been most frequently alleged against the Government by those who have seized upon European education as the direct path to official promotion and professional success ; and the leaven of Western teaching has fermented very rapidly among certain classes in the provinces which have been longest under our sovereignty, and in the cities which have enjoyed uninterrupted peace and prosperity for more than a century. These, in fact, are the centres in which the English language, literature, and sciences have taken deep root, where the conversation of cultured society among Indians is frequently in English, where books written by native authors in good and correct style are produced, where magazines, reviews, and newspapers circulate that, for their style, if not for their tone, are not far below the level of average periodical literature in Europe, and where the law and medicine of the West are professed and practised by Indians who are no unworthy rivals of their foremost competitors from Europe.

There is no difficulty in understanding why the spirit of ardent political liberalism should prevail to a large extent among the leaders of educated Indian society, whose ready appreciation of our learning and science is honourable and praiseworthy, and who may be counted upon for honest and valuable support of the British government. They are fulfilling the prediction of Macaulay by their natural ambition to obtain a share, and to acquire distinction in the administration of their country. It is nevertheless a singular fact, which Macaulay hardly foresaw, that the strongest symptoms of discontent, of agitation, antipathy, and even violent revolt against our rule have been notoriously prevalent in certain sections of the population that have been longest under British sovereignty, and among sections of the class that have profited most indisputably by Western education. The phenomenon is significant, and it should be taken into account in the comparison between ancient and modern Imperialism. Mr. J. Bryce, in one of the studies to which we have already referred, dilates upon the fusing effect of the spread of language and literature in the Roman empire, showing that in the Greek and Latin languages the upper class had 'a factor constantly operative in the assimilation of ideas originally distinct, in the diffusion of knowledge, and in the creation of a common

'type of civilisation . . . the use of Latin and Greek throughout the Empire powerfully tended to draw its parts together.' But he finds that 'the absence in India of any two such dominant tongues and the lower level of intellectual progress keep the vast bulk of the Indian population without any general vehicle for the interchange of thought or for the formation of any one type of literary and scientific culture. There is therefore no national literature in India, nor any prospect that one will arise.' *

This prediction, though Mr. Bryce qualifies it in a subsequent passage, may be questioned as too positive, and at any rate premature: for we may repeat that the Indian experiment is still in too early a stage for any certain conclusion regarding its results. The Latin and Greek languages and literatures were so immeasurably superior to any others within the Roman empire that there was nothing for them to overcome; and they spread with the expansion of the Roman dominion, being principally aided by the triumph of Christianity, the religion of which these two languages were the vehicles and interpreters. And it is necessary again to insist that no inferences drawn from the history of ancient empires in Europe are relevant to the problem of modern Imperialism in Asia. We have to remember that in the provinces outside Europe the Greek language and literature declined and finally disappeared when the Byzantine dominion fell to pieces, as the Latin tongue did from North Africa; so that the sound conclusion seems to be that their existence depended upon the dominion, that they perished in the ruin of the whole political and religious fabric over which they had flourished. Here, indeed, we have an instructive historic lesson that may be studied and taken to heart by those classes in India who are vitally interested in the maintenance of European culture, that it is indissolubly connected with the British sovereignty, and cannot be expected to survive it.

When we reflect that it is not much more than seventy years since Western letters and science began to be seriously studied by Indians even in the old Presidency capitals—Madras, Bombay and Calcutta—we may acknowledge that the time has yet hardly come for a review or valuation of their effect, still less for speculation on their eventual development. Yet it is certainly a remarkable and deplorable result, so far, of our progress in educating our Indian fellow-subjects, that a large part of the miscellaneous publications issued from the native

* Chap. i. p. 73.

presses, with a few notable exceptions, is now employed in depreciating and even defaming the acts and policy of the British government, past and present. Herein consist some of the peculiar difficulties of modern Imperialism, which were unknown to the earlier Asiatic sovereignties. The empires of antiquity had no experience of a free press, and literature was the exclusive possession of the cultured minority. But our own educational system has stimulated among the younger generation an appetite for indiscriminate reading; and many writers find both profit and popularity in stirring up political antipathies and prejudices, and in laying all responsibility for grievances and even such natural calamities as plague or famine upon the Government, which they have nothing to gain by defending, while there is a fine air of audacious independence about attacking it. To this may be added another peculiarly modern difficulty, which was hardly anticipated by those who promulgated free and universal instruction as the panacea for political misunderstandings. It has come to pass that in India education is more directly connected with politics than in any other civilised or partially civilised country. The system of selecting for the various departments of the public service those who can prove literary ability, who have taken high university degrees, or who have won the first places in competitive examinations, has in these latter days been everywhere more or less adopted. In Europe these qualifications do not usually lead beyond the subordinate departments, for the chief executive offices of State are attained by the high parliamentary road. But the Indian administration has been, up to the last two or three years, a vast and undiluted bureaucracy, in which administrative efficiency is the mainspring of promotion. The superior appointments are reserved for those who have passed into the public service through the gate which is opened or shut by examiners, while the inferior departments are all, with very few exceptions, filled by men who have satisfied educational tests, or have won scholastic honours. The obvious result has been to stimulate a rush for public employ, and further to create the belief that literary proficiency establishes a rightful claim to admission. The youth who has taken a creditable university degree considers that he has drawn a bill upon a government by whom the maxim of '*la carrière ouverte aux talents*' has been adopted as a principle of policy.¹ But the claimants are very many; the places are few; there is no room for a clamorous multitude; so mortification and disappointment is the lot of the great majority, who often turn round against

their educators and find vent for their feelings in denouncing them.

The long-suffering Indian government, worried by incessant misrepresentation, has at last been driven into taking some measures for repressing seditious publications, and we are confident that these measures are supported by the approval of moderate and intelligent men, and by all who own property. Seditious agitation of this sort cannot seriously disconcert a firm and well-organised administration. Yet the present condition of a neighbouring empire illustrates the effervescences which European education may bring out among any Asiatic people. In China the system of open literary examinations by which candidates are supposed to qualify for the public services has been for centuries established; and so long as the course of studies was in the national language and literature it was usually harmless. But the Chinese government, probably emulating the example of Japan, has latterly discovered that a sound training in the learning and science of the West is essential to the intellectual elevation of its people, and particularly for raising the level of ability and intelligence among its official services. America was desirous, for motives that can be guessed, to attract Chinese students, and the Chinese government had a particular reason for sending them to a country that was going so fast ahead in the van of progress. The result, however, has been to stimulate the same kind of unrest that is troubling India. We have been informed quite recently that the young Chinamen have returned to their native land with diplomas conferred by the American universities, and also with a conviction that these distinctions ought to be passports to all offices under the State. For a recent French writer tell us that

'le Chinois qui revient de l'étranger ne supporte plus ni avis ni contrôle, ni intervention. La discipline de la philosophie Confucienne a disparu pour faire place à des idées anarchiques. L'ancien état mental n'est plus, et, dit un rapport Chinois "ils sont entraînés par les idées nouvelles à des vues extravagantes et extrêmes à leur détriment et à celui de leur patrie. . . . Dans les provinces, les étudiants deviennent turbulens et dangereux; ils parlent maintenant de leurs droits et leurs privilèges.'

And in an article on 'The Agitation in China' in 'L'Asie Française' we read of 'la mainmise sur l'opinion courante par les étudiants qui rapportent du Japon, d'Amérique ou d'Europe la colossale insuffisance d'une demi-instruction non coassimilée.'

Thus the constitution of the Celestial empire, the oldest

in the world, is disordered by a few doses of the new learning ; and old-fashioned Chinese statesmen must be remembering, with grave misgivings, that in the Taeping rebellion of fifty years ago, which very nearly ruined the Manchu dynasty, the prime mover and leader of that frantic outbreak, Hung Chuan, was a humble student, whose reason had been deranged by repeated failures to pass the tests that qualified for public employ. It is too evident that the new wine of education, which fortifies the stronger minds, acts upon the weaker Asiatic brain as a violent irritant, driving men into reckless animosity against the government that has fostered and then foiled their expectations.

We cannot wonder that the venerable despotism of China should have been painfully discomposed by the rapid absorption of American stimulants. The case of India is very different. At least two generations have grown up since universities and professors began their teaching in the older provinces, whence the new learning spread slowly into Northern India. For a general survey of the course which that movement is taking, and an estimate of the consequences, the time, as we have said, has been much too short. Yet we know that education has powerfully assisted intellectual emancipation, and has perceptibly altered the views and habits of the higher classes in the older provinces. There are already various indications that European literature has turned the thoughts of educated men and women into fresh channels, has coloured their antique philosophy, and has even touched the imaginative faculty of the younger generations in the spheres of poetry and romance. Many of the essays that appear in the Indian magazines or reviews, which are seldom noticed by the outer world, have a reflective and dispassionate tone of criticism or dissertation that is in refreshing contrast with the vociferations of ordinary journalism. It cannot be denied that a large part of the contemporary literature is infected by the prejudices and antipathies of Nationalism. Nevertheless the official reports upon publications annually registered prove commendable literary activity in various directions, in history, in religious and philosophical treatises, in poetry, drama, and fiction ; though it is not probable from the summaries that much of it rises even to a level of respectable mediocrity. That many of the books are translations from English authors may be taken as some measure of the degree to which the taste for precise thinking and accurate knowledge is slowly penetrating the Asiatic mind and correcting the tendency to extravagant and uncritical judgments ; and it may be hoped that familiarity with the historical

work of Europe may in time induce a more conscientious and less distorted view of Indian history than prevails at present, particularly among the half-taught Hindus. Hitherto the historians of India for the period of Mohammedan rule have been almost exclusively Mohammedans, and for the period of British predominance they have been Englishmen, which may partly account for the vehement repudiation by the younger Hindus of chronicles of foreign conquests written by the conquerors. But the Muse of history has always been neglected by the Hindus, while in the classic drama and in epic poetry their genius has always shone out. We now learn from these reports that some of the masterpieces of English poetry have been translated into various dialects for popular use, that several plays of Shakespeare ('Romeo and Juliet' for example) have been likewise rendered in the vernacular, though with excusable imperfections; and that a Bengali version of Homer's 'Iliad,' which is said to have distinct merit, has been produced after some years of labour by the Hindu translator. All predictions as to the future of Asiatic civilisation are hazardous, yet there is here some slight ground for hoping that letters may again rise to the height of a fine art in India, and shake off the contamination of political controversy; so that appreciation of beauty, of pure artistic expression, may again, as in ancient times, draw together East and West, and strengthen the foundations of modern Imperialism.

Professor Mahaffy has told us that * 'the love story—that kind which forms the backbone of all our modern novels—was bequeathed to the Western world by Alexandria. The 'motive,' he adds, 'came in from the East'; where we know that tales, fables, and parables have flourished immemorially. We need not wonder therefore at finding that fiction, which has grown so enormously in the lighter literature of modern Europe, is spreading through India in the shape and fashion of the West. Love-making is the necessary theme, the dialogue is its lively expression, and the Indian novelist takes full advantage of plots and situations that enable him to contrast the manners and minds in two very different societies which have been brought into contrast by the fortune of politics. Here we have a fresh and fertile field for the delineation of scenes and characters, where the Indian youth in England feels the fascination of Western girlhood, and the English girl is touched by the romance of Oriental courtship. On the Indian who has lived in England the vivid and versatile

* The Progress of Hellenism, p. 70.

aspect of social life works a change of habits and tastes which he seldom throws off; he cannot revert to the dull family life of his own country, which was tolerable enough when it was relieved by the hazards and general insecurity of Asiatic existence in the foretime, but has now become doubly monotonous in an age of peaceful uniformity, when all these outer distractions have ceased. The Indian prince can leave his State to the watchful supervision of a British Resident, and can safely enjoy the amusements and dissipations of a luxurious European metropolis. The middle-class Indian youth, bred at an English university, must return to live at home, but he misses the atmosphere of cultured society, and the desire for congenial companionship becomes irresistible. If he has real literary faculty, his dilemma between the old world which is reclaiming him and the new world which has fascinated him finds its most effective illustration in the form of a novel. Of this sort are the situations and contending feelings that are developed in the two novels which we have placed at the head of this article, written in excellent English with a certain refinement of tone that places them at the head of their class.

The author of the 'Prince of Destiny' is known to have passed many years in England; and the hero of his story is the son of a Rajput ruler of an important State, who has taken high honours at Cambridge, has lived in close intimacy with an English family, where his playmate is an English girl of sixteen 'pretty as a dream'; and who is recalled by his father's death to 'sit on the throne of his ancestors.'

Pending his arrival the State of Barathpur has been governed by Vashishta, the high priest of Vishnu, formerly Barath's spiritual director, who combines spiritual with temporal authority, and embodies the religious with the secular conservatism of India. In the book he is frequently likened to Alberoni, who is taken as the type of priestly and political ambition, without reference, however, to the failure and downfall of that famous Spanish primate. The complications that ensue from the clashing of modern with medieval aims and convictions can be easily anticipated. Barath has arrived full of energetic resolution to improve and reform, to organise his administration upon European models, to insist on moral and material progress, to abolish outworn superstitions, to humanise and civilise. Vashishta is the champion of reaction, devoted to the ancient order of things, detesting innovations, prepared in the last resort for conspiracy and armed rebellion against the British sovereignty in his hatred of changes which undermine his sacred prerogatives, and subvert the

ancestral institutions of Hindu rulership. His alarm and indignation reach their climax when Nora, the pretty English girl, arrives in Barathpur as the niece of the British Resident, Lord Melnor, who stands for the portrait of the wise and sympathetic English official, the mediator between inveterate Indian prejudice and the well-meaning but ill-informed policy of Anglo-India. The result is that poor Barath becomes divided in heart between the charms of a beautiful Indian princess, whom he is expected to marry, and his attachment to his old love, Nora having fallen into rather awkward entanglement with both ladies. To Nora, however, he engages himself, whereupon he is promptly cursed and solemnly deposed by the high priest, who absolves all his subjects from their allegiance to him, and takes leave of the renegade prince with the significant words 'We shall meet at Canossa,' proving thereby an acquaintance with European history not common among the Hindu priesthood. The Barathpur army (100,000 men in saffron robes) muster at Vashishta's command, and demand to be led to Delhi. In this great emergency Nora sacrifices herself, breaks off the engagement, and departs for England; while Barath and Savona, the Indian princess, are married 'spiritually'; and Barath abandons his throne for the life of a religious ascetic, awaiting his call to reappear some day as the forerunner of the great Teacher who will proclaim to all earth the doctrine of peace, 'who will turn the armaments of East and West of our generation from instruments of carnage 'into instruments of industry.'

It is an interesting and instructive romance; the author handles the English language with remarkable facility; though his references to European history for analogies of events and persons are at times quaint and questionable. The book exemplifies the ripening of a superior Eastern intellect under Western culture; it exhibits, in a fine tone and temper, the contest between ancient and modern sentiments and usages that is beginning to prevail in India, the contending hopes and misgivings that perplex the higher minds as they watch the adventurous course of modern Imperialism in their country; the stumbles of the British government over unforeseen obstacles, the errors and misunderstandings on both sides; the painful search for some path that is to bring about the ideal consummation of national unity and concord. It is particularly noteworthy that Mr. S. C. Ghose rides boldly, so to speak, at the stiffest fence which actually separates the two races; he finds no hopeless improbability in the prospect of intermarriage between Englishmen and Indian women of good birth and

breeding ; he appears almost to count upon it for the eventual obliteration, in India as in other countries, of national and social antipathies, for the amalgamation of alien communities on the basis of morals and manners refined up to the same level. Yet the conclusion of this story, which ends with the hero's platonic marriage with an Indian princess and the withdrawal of the English girl, shows what difficulties still bar such unions ; and it also suggests the question whether the elevation of Indian women to an equal standard of feminine delicacy and accomplishment may not before long dispose the civilised Indian youth to look at home among his own people for the amenities that have hitherto attracted him to English women. However, if the fusion of the two races can be contemplated, it is the bringing of European wives into Indian households that is important, though few who know the risks and anomalies of that situation will encourage it. For the marriage of an Englishman with an Indian lady has little or no effect upon the international problem, since they almost invariably make a final settlement in Europe, when they become ordinary members of the husband's class in the land of their domicile.

This latter case, indeed, is the subject of the second novel under review, 'Hindupore' ; where ' a young Irish member of 'Parliament, full of ardour and zeal for the true welfare of the 'Indian empire which he is about to visit,' Lord Tara, weds and carries back to his hereditary castle the niece of a Hindu Rajah. The principal *dramatis personae* in the two novels have some external resemblance, though the plot is changed, and the characters are differently assigned. In both the stories a Rajput chief plays the leading part, but the Rajah of Hindupore is a middle-aged man whose ' broad intellectual brow ' and air of grave politeness mark him as a person of high distinction. Lord Tara makes his acquaintance during the passage by steamer to Bombay, for the Rajah is returning from Italy, where he has been honoured by an interview with the Pope, and by some interesting conversation with His Holiness upon Christianity in India. On landing they are met by the Rajah's prime minister, who is in every respect but his office entirely unlike the high priest of Vishnu—a man profoundly conversant with all the undercurrents of Indian politics, liberal and practical, a shrewd and experienced official. The texture of this story is light, we have no scenes of passionate emotion where lovers meet to be torn apart, no conflict between fanatic patriotism and exotic modernism. Lord Tara visits his friend the Rajah at his palace in the Hindupore State ; he is there

captivated by the reports of the beauty and virtues of the Rajah's niece, Princess Kamala ; he is shown her photograph, he even catches one glimpse of her face ; and he thereupon makes his formal proposal, quite in Oriental fashion, to her uncle. Mohun Lall, the sagacious minister, when consulted by his chief, approves immediately, on the ground that 'a marriage like this would do more than fifty treaties to bring the two races into closer touch with each other.' The princess has heard nothing but praise of her wooer—they meet and their mutual attachment is confirmed. Lord Tara is wedded in Hindu costume, with the hearty good-will of the Hindu friends and relations, and after some travelling about India together and a visit to the temple of Jagganath, the curtain falls on the departure of bride and bridegroom for England.

It is a pleasantly written tale of happy love-making, varied from the ordinary European pattern by placing the scene in India, by the Oriental colouring that is given to the incidents and situations ; and bringing out not unskillfully some of the salient points of contrast between Eastern and Western sentiments and notions of propriety, especially the Eastern disapproval of unreserved intimacy between the two sexes. We have the caricature of a rude irascible British official, not altogether imaginary, though against this may be set the full-length portrait of an exemplary civilian who is all that could be desired.

Of these two novels we have merely sketched the bare outline ; to do more would have been outside our present purpose. To that purpose they are relevant as illustrating the growing influence over the best sort of Indian light literature of English models in composition and sentiment ; and particularly because in each novel the culminating interest lies in the ardent affection that springs up between English and Indian men and women. Well born and educated folk of the two races meet on equal terms ; their friendship and mutual affection thrive on identity of social refinement and intellectual superiority. On these conditions the union of blending East and West into a composite society by intermarriage is evidently, to these Indian writers, no chimera ; it is indeed foreshadowed as giving fair promise that, with the increase and multiplication of common feelings and sympathies, intermarriage may, as time goes on, solve that crucial problem of national fusion which, according to Mr. Bryce, forms the despair of statesmanship. This may be no more than the fiction of ingenious romancers in search of new dramatic effects and striking situations ; nevertheless it ranks the writers above the class of political pamphleteers

and shows, perhaps, that they have more faith in ideas than in institutions, more reliance, for international unity, on the diffusion of culture than on the working of constitutional reforms.

To conclude, it may be doubted whether from the comparison of ancient with modern imperialism can be extracted any other profitable lesson than this—that while a firm and well-ordered government is the basis of all national progress, the elevation and enlightened intelligence that follow the spread of the highest learning, literature, and physical science are essential to the cement of the political fabric, that they are indispensable elements of its permanence. The Romans were consummate administrators, they organised their Asiatic provinces on a system and by methods civil and military which resemble in many curious details those which have been adopted by the British in India ; they were liberal and tolerant rulers. Yet it was the Hellenic civilisation, protected and prospering under the Roman empire, that facilitated and gave durability to that era of European dominion in Asia by securing to it the support of the educated classes. When, after several centuries, the Byzantine power in the East was overthrown by the Mohammedan conquests, it was succeeded by a government that despised and rejected the sciences, philosophies, and letters of the West, and consequently by the restoration of a period, not yet ended, of ignorance, intolerance, and general misrule, except when an able despot or dynasty improved matters for an interval. According to Renan, the decadence of the Mahomedan States, the intellectual nullity and impoverishment of their people in countries once flourishing and progressive, are due entirely to the contempt with which all scientific culture has fallen since the light of Western civilisation was extinguished. This is the lesson of history that should be taken to heart by that half-educated class in India (to be carefully distinguished from the upper order of really cultivated and serious thinkers) who appear to believe that some acquaintance with the English language and literature, some aptitude as writers, authorise them to disparage, decry, and even aim at supplanting a government on whose will and power the nascent civilisation of their country entirely depends. For the withdrawal of England's guidance and control could hardly fail to reopen the floodgates of warlike invasion and internal confusion that have so long retarded the developement of culture among a people whose intellectual capacities entitle them to be placed in the very first rank among the races of Asia. It is certain that European civilisation in Asia has never yet survived the disappearance of European dominion.

ART. VI.—THE COST OF LIVING OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

1. *Cost of Living of the Working Classes.* Report of an enquiry by the Board of Trade into Working Class Rents, Housing and Retail Prices, together with the standard rates of wages prevailing in certain occupations in the principal industrial towns of the United Kingdom. 1908. [Cd. 3864.]
2. *Cost of Living &c., &c., in the principal industrial towns of the German Empire.* 1908. [Cd. 4032.]
3. *Cost of Living . . . in the principal industrial towns of France.* 1909. [Cd. 4512.]
4. *Cost of Living . . . in the principal industrial towns of Belgium.* 1910. [Cd. 5065.]

THE boyish phrase that something is as big as a bit of chalk or as long as a piece of string provokes a smile in the man who dogmatizes boldly upon national degeneration, or the condition of the working classes, without more than a childish modicum of the sense of precise measurement or any clear idea of the criteria to be measured. At best he is comparing vague impressions of the present with almost complete ignorance of the irrecoverable past.

Our knowledge upon the all-important question of the condition of the people is very imperfect. Exact observation, minute, synthetic, on a well-organised plan, attained its highest level in Le Play's monumental work '*Les Ouvriers Européens*,' 1855, one of the great books of the world, though the late Lord Acton preferred in his list of the hundred best books to include the same author's more didactic treatise '*La Réforme Sociale*.' Le Play's method was to spend a month or two with or near a workman's family, designated by good local judges as fairly typical, and to portray it with photographic fidelity and microscopical thoroughness—its history, its property, its annual income and expenditure, its tastes, habits, health, morals, work, pleasures, problems, its housing and environment—in fine almost every detail relevant to its well-being. Every article of furniture is inventoried and valued, every garment appraised. A separate profit and loss account is opened for the pig. The value of the wife's work about the house is estimated and allowed for. The sense of humour is set at defiance. The result is such a

picture of industrial life in Europe fifty years or more ago as has never been equalled. To turn over the pages is to make a sociological tour more interesting and instructive than the most enthusiastic philosopher is likely ever to be able to make in his own person. Thirty-six families are studied, from the rag-picker of Paris to the Tartar shepherd on the Caucasian steppes. The *Société d'Economie Sociale*, founded by Le Play, continues his work at the rate of one or two monographs a year. This is the intensive method. It has been followed to some extent by Mr. Charles Booth and Mr. Rowntree, and in a little volume of 'Family Budgets,' 1896, compiled by the Economic Club of London. The instrument is too delicate to be handled with complete success by a public department, though in Germany municipal, State, and Imperial authorities have all in partial measure essayed it. The United States set the example of the extensive method on a large scale in 1890 by the compilation of the budgets of some thousands of workmen's families, with the averages and percentages dear to statisticians. This method has a different aim. It is more summary, less personal, not diving down beyond certain externals capable of tabulation—the expenditure on rent, food, clothing, and so forth.

UNITED KINGDOM.

Our own Government has entered somewhat tardily upon this same path of extensive enquiry. A tentative effort was made in a small Blue Book in 1889, 'Returns of Expenditure by Working Men' (Cd. 5861). But the first serious attack on the problem was made in the so-called Fiscal Blue Books (Cd. 1761 of 1903 and Cd. 2237 of 1904) which contained memoranda on the consumption of food and the cost of living of the working classes in the urban districts of the United Kingdom, based on 1944 budgets of working-class families. These memoranda were admittedly imperfect in respect of the rents usually paid for workmen's dwellings and the range of prices for food stuffs. The bulky Yellow Book of 1908 (Cd. 3864) attempts to remedy these defects and to establish a standard of comparison applicable to different districts of the United Kingdom and also to foreign countries as a basis for comparing working-class conditions at home and abroad. It has been followed by enquiries on similar lines in respect of Germany, France, Belgium, and the United States, upon which last country the Report has not yet been published. The purpose of the present article is to give a summary though not uncritical

account of the methods followed and the results obtained so far as the cost of living is concerned.

The difficulties of the Board of Trade undertaking were enormous. They were with doubtful wisdom increased by the decision to take the month of October 1905 as the standard for all prices, and the discovery of these old prices is already becoming no easy matter. What is the price of bread to-day in London? Even after ruling out 'fancy' bread in which milk, lard, potatoes, or other special ingredients may be found, the variations are wide. The West End baker with a high rent, heavy rates, long credits, bad debts, and expenses of book-keeping and delivery, must needs sell at a higher price than the East-end Co-operative store, where the customer pays cash down and takes his loaf away. Yet a loaf is a loaf; and when the weight and quality are the same we are comparing like with like. Rent is a more complicated matter. The number of rooms may be the same, but one family may live in a basement or an attic, another on the best floor. The size of the rooms may differ. One residence may be in a pleasant quarter with a bright cheerful outlook, the other in a squalid dreary neighbourhood. Every parish in London has its working-men. One lives near his work and pays a high rent: another pays less rent but has to expend time and money daily in getting to and fro. We may know what is spent in rent, but what is received in return can hardly be tabulated.

It follows that the condition of the working-classes is not fully known when we have set out their money wages and certain figures of their expenditure. Nor are such figures, even if complete, by any means an infallible guide to the utilities enjoyed. A good housewife (perhaps before her marriage a well-trained domestic servant) will feed and clothe her family well, while another mother, taken from the factory and unable to patch or darn or to cook a decent meal, will spend the same amount with a lamentably inferior result. But the figures are, nevertheless, a useful indication, a first approximation for comparative purposes, of which we do well to avail ourselves. They are solid footing from which to advance in our knowledge of the subject. The method adopted by the Board of Trade is to fix the metropolis as the standard for each country, except that in England the middle zone of London is taken, by which is meant the area lying between the City, W., N.W., and S.W. districts at the centre and the outlying suburbs bordering on the country. The prices selected are those which predominate in the returns

for each locality. If two rooms are the general rule in a particular town their rent is compared with that of two rooms in the metropolis, if three the comparison is with three. For articles of food an index number is composed by comparing the prices of commodities which enter most commonly into the dietary of the working classes. Here again the composition and efficacy of the dietaries vary considerably. The Scottish workman eats much oatmeal and little imported meat, the English workman much imported meat and little oatmeal. For this reason both imported meat and oatmeal are excluded from the index number, a decision open to serious criticism. The Irishman consumes more potatoes. Why not exclude potatoes? And where are we to stop in this direction, especially when we are dealing with foreign countries? It would have been interesting if the average quantities of different articles of food consumed per family in England, Scotland, and Ireland had been taken and the values of typical dietaries worked out in calories or units of the energy which they are calculated to supply. We are but at the beginning of investigation on these lines though the beginning is substantial. Let us turn to the results.

In the United Kingdom ninety-four industrial towns have been selected, of which seventy-seven are in England and Wales, eleven in Scotland, and six in Ireland. The occupations singled out for examination are those most generally distributed—the building, engineering, printing (hand-compositors only) and furnishing trades. The prevalence of the four- and five-roomed type of dwelling among these classes is remarkable. The difference of rent in London (the middle zone as above defined) and in the provinces is shown in the following table:

TABLE I.
PREDOMINANT RANGE OF WEEKLY RENTS INCLUDING ALL RATES.

	Two rooms.	Three rooms.	Four rooms.	Five rooms.	Six rooms.
London	4/6 to 7/6	6/- to 9/-	7/6 to 10/6	9/- to 13/-	10/6 to 15/6
Provincial Towns	3/- to 3/6	3/9 to 4/6	4/6 to 5/6	5/6 to 6/6	6/6 to 7/9

If rent in London be represented by 100, Croydon and Plymouth (with Devonport) stand next at 81, Newcastle-on-Tyne 76, Birkenhead 70, gradually descending to Macclesfield 32. The Eastern counties generally show the lowest mean index number, cheap land and low wages reflecting their influence in the cost of houses. Sanitation improves in

England from North to South and in other respects the types of houses show considerable local variation. Moreover if the neighbouring towns of Halifax and Huddersfield be compared, the rents for two, three or five rooms at Halifax are much lower, while if four rooms be taken as the basis the rents at Halifax are higher. This is by no means a solitary example. Caution is, therefore, necessary in drawing conclusions from the indications of comparative rents. Overcrowding, as might be expected, is less frequent in the very low-rented towns, but it is not always at its greatest in the localities where rent is highest.

In Scotland the urban workman generally lives in a flat of one, two or three rooms. The predominant weekly rents are for one room 2s. to 2s. 6d., two rooms 3s. 10d. to 4s. 3d., three rooms 5s. 2d. to 6s. 5d. The range of local variation is much narrower than in England and Wales. Thus Edinburgh (with Leith) 100, is in much the same position as Glasgow 99, and only two towns fall below 84, viz., Perth 76 and Galashiels 69.

In Ireland, Dublin stands apart as London does in England. The demand for working-class accommodation in Dublin is rather in excess of the supply, which consists in great measure of large houses once occupied by the wealthier classes and now let as tenements. The rooms in Dublin are, therefore, usually more spacious than those in other Irish towns. Local rates are also higher. In Dublin the rents are for one room 2s. to 3s., two rooms 3s. to 4s. 6d., three rooms 4s. to 6s., four rooms 6s. to 8s., and five rooms 8s. to 10s. Taking Ireland as a whole the predominant weekly rents are for one room 1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d., two rooms 2s. 6d. to 3s. 6d., three rooms 4s. to 5s., four rooms 5s. 6d. to 6s. 9d. The index numbers are Dublin 100, Limerick 69, Cork 66, Belfast 61, Londonderry 54, Waterford 53.

Passing to the prices of provisions and such household commodities as fuel and light we find many curious variations. Food is generally dearer in Scotland and Ireland than in England and Wales, and this is true even of Irish butter, which costs 1s. a pound in most English towns as against 1s. 2d. in Ireland. The qualities of the articles are not always the same for different towns, as the predominant prices are selected from returns rendered by representative tradesmen having a working-class *clientèle* and by co-operative societies. But we might have expected that the ubiquity of 'multiple shops' or branches of large trading companies, the facilities of the parcel post, and the readiness of great central stores to

send carriage-paid consignments of moderate value, would have made more powerfully for equalisation. Even in the same locality the relative prices of bread and flour show much divergence. If we prepare a table beginning with the towns where flour is cheapest we find such examples as these :

TABLE II.
PREDOMINANT PRICES OF FLOUR AND BREAD.

	Flour (per 7 lbs.)	Loaf (4 lbs.)
	d.	d.
Middlesbrough	8	6
Newport (Mon.)	8 to 9	4
Carlisle	8 to 9	6
York	8½ to 9	6
Stoke-on-Trent	9	4½
Southampton	9 to 10	5
Worcester	10	4 to 5
Falkirk	11 to 1s.-	5
In London 7 lbs. of flour cost on the average 9·7d. and the 4 lb. loaf a trifle under 5d.		

The expense of converting flour into bread is affected by such factors as the cost of coal, rent and wages, and the prevalence of home-baking. The price of bread is frequently twice as high in Chicago as in London when the price of flour at the same centres is approximately equal.

Quantities consumed depend partly upon the means of the family, partly upon the number of mouths to be filled. The next table gives the average number of children living at home in the different groups :

TABLE III.

Weekly Income of family	Under 25/-	25/- and under 30/-	30/- and under 35/-	35/- and under 40/-	40/- and over
Average No. of children	3·1	3·3	3·2	3·4	4·4

Excluding the last group, where the family unit is larger, the consumption of bread and flour is about 29 lbs. a week in each class. Increased incomes are associated with larger supplies of meat, fish, milk, butter, tea, and sugar. Potatoes are fairly uniform from 14 to 16 lbs. a week. The proportion of the income spent on food naturally diminishes as the income rises. For incomes under 30s. two-thirds of the total income is spent on food, for incomes of 40s. and over about 57 per cent.

Taking the average of all classes the consumption of a working class family in a week is as follows :

TABLE IV.

Tea	0·6 lb.	Potatoes	17 lbs.
Sugar	5½ lbs.	Flour	10 lbs.
Bacon	1½ lb.	Bread	22 lbs.
Eggs	12	Milk	10 pints
Cheese	$\frac{3}{4}$ lb.	Meat	6½ lbs.
Butter	2 lbs.	Coal	2 cwts.

Weighted index numbers constructed by allowing for the relative importance of the articles as given above, and taking London as 100, show nine towns with higher prices in England and Wales, Dover at the head of the list with 106 and Stockport and Wigan at the bottom with 88. Variations in the price of coal have an important bearing on this list. In Scotland and Ireland the metropolitan index number of prices is not far removed from that of other towns in the same countries.

The next step is to frame a combined index number for rents and prices. A weight of four is assigned to prices and one to rent on the assumption that four times as much is expended on food &c. as on rent. London, 100, again heads the list, but low rents are sometimes offset by high prices. Thus Dover with 56 for rent and 106 for prices stands third on the list with a combined figure of 96. The Lancashire and Cheshire groups come lowest, and Macclesfield (78) stands at the bottom of the table. In Scotland the range is from 101, Dundee, to 94, Aberdeen, as compared with 100 for Edinburgh (with Leith). In Ireland Dublin is the dearest city, 100, Waterford the lowest, 84.

Finally the weekly rates of wages in the selected trades are examined. A serious imperfection here is the neglect of the amount of unemployment, though some of the occupations such as painting and bricklaying are much affected by the weather and by seasonal fluctuations. London, 100, is surpassed by Croydon with 105 for skilled and 110 for unskilled men in the building trade, but all other towns are on the whole lower, Taunton showing only 74 and 69 respectively in the building trades with 77 and 79 for engineering and 62 for skilled compositors. The Southern and Eastern counties of England show comparatively low wages for skilled men and labourers alike. The rates of wages are slightly higher in Glasgow than in Edinburgh, and in Belfast than in Dublin except

for bricklayers' labourers 90 and printers 97. The enquiry fails to establish any general law of connexion between local variations of wages and cost of living. The able investigation of Mr. F. W. Lawrence 'Local Variations in Wages, 1899' might have been referred to with advantage here and elsewhere. Mr. Lawrence found that apart from special disturbing circumstances the larger the town the higher the wage, that an approximate measure of the differences in wages is to turn the square roots of the populations of the most prominent towns into money at the rate of 800 to a penny, that artisans' wages and labourers' wages in the same town generally vary together in the proportion of something like three to two, the variations being, however, more nearly equal in amount than in proportion, and that wages in the building trades tend to be high where population is rapidly increasing, and *vice versa*.

The workman's wage is not the only factor in the family income. From an analysis of 579 returns relating to families with a total weekly income of 40s. or above, it appears that in 102 cases the whole income, averaging 43s. 9d., was earned by the father; in 312 cases the father earned 34s. 5d. and other members of the family 15s. 5d. a week; in 165 cases the father contributed 32s. 3d. and other members of the family 32s. 11d., or more than one half of the total. In this last group are sons or daughters over 21 years of age. But it is not uncommon, especially in the textile districts, for the wife herself to be a wage-earner. We are not informed whether in such cases her earnings are returned net, after deduction of payments for help in doing her work at home. Her wages at the mill are liable to a serious subtrahend for the loss, direct and indirect, caused by leaving her house, her children, and her cooking in the hands of another.

We may pause here to point out the difficulty of answering succinctly the question—what are the money wages of a skilled bricklayer in the United Kingdom? They vary in the Returns before us from 30s. to 46s. 3d. a week (summer wages) according to locality. What are his real wages or command over the necessaries and comforts of life? Rents and prices of certain commodities are measured and show considerable adjustment to be necessary before conclusions are drawn from the money wages. What is his 'condition' or standard of comfort? From 18 to 30 per cent. of his expenses are unaccounted for, and this margin includes such items as clothing, boots, medicine, travelling, meals away from home, and contributions to societies. To measure his power of spending is something, to gauge his power of buying is an advance; to know the way in

which this latter power is exercised and the use which is made of what is bought is the distant goal of social investigation.

In the application of this comparative method to foreign countries the enquirer is evidently confronted with aggravated difficulties. Differences in climate, in diet, and in tastes and modes of life may reach a point where we are no longer comparing like with like. But the comparable features of the workman of this country and of our nearest Continental neighbours are numerous and important enough to make a parallel useful.

GERMANY.

Returns of weekly income and expenditure on rent and food for a normal week were obtained from 5046 families of a workman and his wife and children living at home. The forms of enquiry were distributed through trades unions and other workmen's societies in thirty-three German towns containing altogether about nine millions of inhabitants. Almost all classes in German towns live in flats and the normal dwelling of the urban workman consists of three rooms in a tenement. The rents include the charge for water and in some cases small charges for chimney sweeping and the removal of refuse, but they do not include any element of local taxation. The predominant rents are :—

TABLE V.

	Two rooms.	Three rooms.	Four rooms.
Berlin	5/- to 6/-	7/- to 9/3	*
Other towns	2/8 to 3/6	3/6 to 4/9	4/3 to 6/-

* Occur only in insignificant numbers.

The index number for Berlin, 100, is approached only by Stuttgart, 97. The next in order is Düsseldorf, 79, the fourth, Dortmund, dropping to 68. The lowest on the list are Brunswick 37, Stassfurt 33. Oschersleben 28. In Central Germany as a whole the average is 35—South Germany 65, and the Rhineland-Westphalia hardware towns 64, standing highest outside Berlin. Here also, as in England, the mean level of rents falls as we pass from groups of larger to smaller towns though the range within each group is considerable.

Broadly speaking the sums expended in rent in Germany differ very little from those spent in the United Kingdom with the important exception that in Germany the workman has to

contribute an additional sum estimated at 18 per cent. of his rent to the local authorities usually in the form of a local income tax. Where an *octroi* exists it adds to the cost of the articles of consumption upon which it is levied.

The price of provisions is complicated at the outset by the varieties of bread sold in German towns. White wheaten bread is eaten by the German workmen to only a very small extent. Taking Barmen as a typical example we find the grades of bread bought by the working classes to be rye once ground, rye twice ground, two thirds rye and one third wheat, two fifths rye and three fifths wheat, one third rye and two thirds wheat, and wheat. At Dresden and some other places rye is mixed with maize. As there is no standard quality so also there is no standard size of the loaf throughout Germany. The prices of grey bread (rye and wheat mixed) are taken as the standard in preference to those of black (rye) bread, which were only procurable for 15 out of the 33 towns. The predominant prices for 4 lbs. of grey bread (always in October 1905) were from 4½*d.* to 6½*d.*, and for 7 lbs. of wheaten flour from 11½*d.* to 1*s.* 1¾*d.*, rising in Berlin, Dresden, Munich and some other cities to 1*s.* 3¼*d.* A 4 lb. loaf of black bread costs on the average 5·68*d.* at Berlin, and 5*d.* at Mülhausen. In 22 towns comprising a population of about 7½ millions some 10,000 tons of horseflesh were sold at prices ranging from 2½*d.* to 5½*d.* a pound. At Bremen the figure is as high as 6 lbs. per head per annum or about 30 lbs. per family of five persons. Excluding the families who do not buy this form of meat the consumption among the working classes of Bremen must be substantial, but in the majority of towns it is relatively small. Meat is usually sold in Germany free from all bone or with very little bone, and is almost all home-killed. Mutton is so little appreciated that it forms only 1 per cent. of the total meat consumption shown in the budgets for South Germany, and its price everywhere is lower than that of beef or pork. The cheap Limburg cheese, much favoured by the German working classes, is not to be found in England, and German coffee, largely adulterated with roasted barley, malt, and rye, is consumed almost to the exclusion of tea and cocoa.

The average number of children living at home in the families from which returns were received were:—

TABLE VI.

Weekly income	Under 20/-	20/- and under 25/-	25/- and under 30/-	30/- and under 35/-	35/- and under 40/-	40/- and over
No. of children	2·37	2·28	2·51	2·51	2·79	3·76

The family unit is smaller than in the British returns (Table III.) and this must be taken into account in comparing the quantities consumed. Bread and flour rise steadily, group by group from 22 lbs. a week to 38·21. Increased incomes are spent chiefly upon additional bread, meat, milk, eggs, cheese, butter, coffee, and sugar. Potatoes enter largely into the dietary of the German workman, averaging over 28 lbs. a week in the lowest class—rather it would seem from motives of economy as the figure drops to 25½ in the second group and below 24 in the next two. For comparison with Table IV. we have the following figures of the consumption of a German working-class family in a normal week :—

TABLE VII.

Coffee	¾ lb.	Potatoes	26 lbs.
Sugar	2 lbs.	Flour	2 lbs.
Bacon	¾ lb.	Bread	25 lbs.
Eggs	10	Milk	13 pints
Cheese	½ lb.	Meat	3½ lbs.
Butter	1½ lb.	Coal	1½ cwt.

The index number of prices weighted in accordance with these quantities show Berlin (100) twenty-first on the list. The extreme range is from Bremen 110, to Breslau 95, with one exception, Königshütte 86. South Germany comes highest, Silesia lowest. Here again the cost of coal has an important bearing.

When rents and prices are combined on the basis of 1 to 4 as before, only one town, Stuttgart, 106, stands ahead of Berlin and one, Mannheim, on the same level, 100. The descent is very gradual to Oschersleben 84, Königshütte 78, again at the bottom of the list. Local variations are thus less marked than in the United Kingdom.

With wages we are less directly concerned, but it may be noted that for bricklayers the predominant rates for a full week in summer range from 26s. 11d. to 31s. 3d. outside Berlin and average 39s. 1d. in that city. The general conclusion arrived at is that money wages for all the trades concerned are lower by about 17 per cent. than in England, the hours of labour about 10 per cent. higher, the cost of food, rent, and fuel, measured by the English standard, about one fifth higher. In other words the English workman who migrated to Germany and lived as nearly as possible in the old way (with some necessary changes such as coffee for tea) would work about 10 per cent. longer, receive about three-fourths of his previous rate of hourly wages, and pay one fifth more for his food, rent, and fuel. On

the other hand a German workman coming in the same spirit to England, where potatoes are about 13 per cent. dearer and milk 33 per cent. dearer, would find his expenditure decrease only in the ratio of 108 to 100. Allowing for the smaller number of children in the German families 'the German dietary would appear to provide almost the same amount of nutrition as the 'English.' This is a matter, as already suggested, susceptible of precise measurement.

How far may the conclusions of the Board of Trade volume be accepted as trustworthy? The information contained especially in the monographs upon particular towns is the richest collection of material extant in the English language as to the industrial conditions of Germany. But the statistics of the cost of living leave much to be desired. The Imperial Statistical Office of Berlin roundly declares that the results cannot be regarded as an accurate representation of an 'average' or 'typical' working-class family. We may reply that the average refers only to selected groups of trades, but even so the method adopted can hardly inspire confidence. If we ask a thousand boys in the elementary schools to state the latitude and longitude of Bombay, the average of their replies would probably be very far from accurate. Let the reader who does not keep household accounts sit down to render a statement of his 'normal' week's expenditure, one fifty-second of a year's outlay, with due regard to the fact that in winter he usually spends more on fuel and light, food and clothing. Such estimates can be but a more or less successful shot at the truth. The German Government Blue-book, '*Erhebung von Wirtschaftsrechnungen minderbemittelter Familien im Deutschen Reiche*' (Berlin, 1909), follows the intensive method as regards family expenditure and is for our purpose extremely valuable. 3575 families were furnished with account books in which they were requested to enter their expenditure, quantities and cost, item by item, every day for a whole year—(1907). The perforated leaves were torn out at weekly intervals and sent to the Statistical officers of Berlin or of the local State, who at once raised queries upon discrepancies or improbabilities. 1916 families kept accounts from one to five months, 699 from six to eleven months, and no fewer than 960, or more than one quarter, for a whole year. The results are classified, summarised, and published, and some of the results are shown below.

A bibliography is given of the principal writings on Workmen's Budgets, and, though far from complete, it includes thirty-seven entries of studies by German writers who have

devoted great attention to important points of statistical technique upon this subject. One illustration must suffice. To arrive at an average individual's consumption, allowance must be made for the fact that an adult taken as a unit consumes more food than a child. The weights assigned by the German Statistical Office are for a child under four years, 0·1; from 4 to 7, 0·2; from 7 to 10, 0·3; from 10 to 13, 0·4; from 13 to 15, 0·5; from 15 until they cease growing, girls 0·8, boys 1. Different weights have been taken by different writers and a general agreement has not yet been reached. The Board of Trade has not adopted this refinement. On the other hand the German Blue Book is silent as to prices and quantities, and does not use an index number. Taking the 960 accounts which were kept for a whole year and sifting out a number which for reasons given are deemed unsuitable for inclusion, there remain 852 fair samples, of which 418 families spend less than 100*l.* a year, 293 from 100*l.* to 150*l.*, and 141 over 150*l.*

TABLE VIII.

PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL EXPENDITURE IN 852 SELECTED GERMAN FAMILIES
(FROM THE GERMAN BLUE BOOK).

ANNUAL EXPENDITURE.

	Under £100.	£100-£150.	£150 and over.	All incomes.
Food	52·3	45·9	36·2	45·5
Clothing	10·7	13·3	14·3	12·6
Rent	17·7	17·8	18·5	18·0
Fuel and Light	4·7	4·0	3·5	4·1
Sundries	14·6	19·0	27·5	19·8

The Board of Trade percentages of weekly income spent on food in German working-class families are 68·7 for families with incomes of under 20*s.* a week; 64·5, 62·3, 59·2, 57·7, and 56·3 for each succeeding group at intervals of 5*s.* a week, the last group 40*s.* and over. The German figures include the accounts of some small officials and others not engaged in manual labour, but the discrepancy is too great to be explained away by small disturbances. It can hardly be doubted that in the Board of Trade 'normal' week we have an example of bad estimates. The tendency is almost always to overstate expenditure by rounding up and to under-estimate income by insufficient allowance for casual receipts.*

* Even on the basis of actual records the German accounts show an average annual income of £109 and expenditure of £111, attributed to the omission of tips, overtime money, windfalls, &c.

An interesting table in the German Report shows the total income and expenditure month by month throughout a year for forty-two selected families. The variations of income are very striking, those of expenditure rather less, owing to resort to savings or frequently to credit, but in many cases the maximum monthly expenditure is two or three times the minimum. Nothing is said in either the German or the English Report as to the 'time-tax' involved in compulsory military service.

FRANCE.

Enquiries were made in thirty French towns comprising over six millions of inhabitants, and budgets of expenditure are framed from 5205 returns for a 'normal' week, with prices as for October 1905.

The types of housing in France differ so greatly in different localities that M. de Foville's brilliant volume '*Les maisons types*' in which the various forms of building are described (with in many cases explanations of the influences of history or climatic conditions which go far to account for them) would almost enable the aerial traveller over France to identify the district below him. In the North of France labour conditions are very largely affected by the considerable supply of Belgian labour which is available. At Marseilles the Italian workmen and at Toulouse the Spanish workmen exercise a marked influence. The workman's dwelling in France is usually a flat in a tenement, but in about one third of the towns, especially in the North, Lille, and the smaller towns, the small house predominates. For the flats two or three rooms are the rule. Their sanitary condition almost always falls short of even the more moderate requirements of modern hygiene. Water has to be fetched from taps, from landings, or from hydrants in the streets, and overcrowding is common. Rents do not include any express provision for local taxation, which is so variable from town to town and from house to house that it cannot be estimated with precision. It bears no uniform relation to rent, and the amount which falls upon the working classes (even if the *octroi* be included) is very small. The predominant range of weekly rents is as follows :

TABLE IX.

	One room.	Two rooms.	Three rooms.	Four rooms.
Paris	—	3/1 to 6/2	4/7 to 7/5	6/2 to 7/8
Rest of France	1/4 to 1/11	2/4 to 2/10	2/11 to 4/2	3/6 to 4/4

Taking Paris as 100 we have Lyons 77, Nancy 73, Bordeaux 71, and all others under 70, descending gradually to Roanne 37. The same general conclusion is found that the mean level of rents falls as we pass from the groups of larger to smaller towns.

The number of children per family is perceptibly smaller than in England and Germany.

TABLE X.

Weekly income	Under 20/-	20/- to 25/-	25/- to 30/-	30/- to 35/-	35/- to 40/-	40/- and over
Average No. of children	1.57	1.77	1.80	1.92	2.13	2.91

A remarkable feature of the French budgets is the relatively high contribution of the earnings of the wife and children to the family income. The expenditure on food and rent in the six groups above is :

TABLE XI.

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON FOOD AND RENT.

Income	Under 20/-	20/- to 25/-	25/- to 30/-	30/- to 35/-	35/- to 40/-	40/- and over
Food	62.7	60.8	58.6	57.9	56.1	52.8
Rent	12.3	11.2	10.1	9.7	9.7	8.4

Local variations in price are not wide. Home baking is almost unknown in the towns, and purchases of flour by urban workmen's families are negligible. Wheaten bread is the general rule. The consumption ranges from 22.9 lbs. per week in the lowest income group to 27.6 in the fifth and to 35.9 in the highest (where there are more mouths). Potatoes rise from 12½ lbs. in the lowest to 20½ lbs. in the highest group. As a general rule the consumption of potatoes per head is highest in the poorest classes. Horseflesh is very generally eaten and amounts to about 11.2 per cent. of the total meat in these budgets. At Nancy it is 32 per cent., Brest 24, and Bourges 23. Its consumption is increasing in Paris, Marseilles, Toulouse, and other large towns. As much as 8½ lbs. per head per annum is consumed in Reims, taking the whole population, 7 lbs. in Roubaix, 5 lbs. in Lille, and 4 lbs. in Rouen. Its use is not so much due to poverty as to taste and to a belief in its medicinal qualities. In many parts of France it is recommended to persons suffering from tuberculosis or from anæmia. A pound

of horse steak costs from 6*d.* to 8*d.* and of fillet from 9*d.* to 11*d.* Almost all the meat eaten in France is home-killed. The predominant prices of wheaten flour per 7 lbs. in October 1905 range from 9½*d.* per lb. at Troyes to 1*s.* 3¼*d.* to 1*s.* 6¼*d.* at Lyons, but these are exceptional. The Paris price of 1*s.* 0¼*d.* is the most general. White bread is usually 6*d.* per 4-lb. loaf—Lyons again the highest with 6½*d.* to 7¼*d.*, Brest 4¼*d.* to 5½*d.* the lowest. At Paris and Troyes the price is 6*d.* The dietary of the French working-class family is more varied than that of the British family possessing the same income, owing largely to the greater use of vegetables and macaroni. Allowing for the difference in the number of children it is also greater in quantity. The average consumption per French family in one week is shown below.

TABLE XII.

Coffee	0·6 lb.	Bread	29 lbs.
Sugar	1¾ lb.	Milk	8 pints
Eggs	10	Meat	6 lbs.
Butter	1¼ lb.		
Potatoes	16 lbs.		

Bacon, Cheese, Flour, and Coal are insignificant in amount.

The index number of prices begins with Marseilles 122; Calais 109; Paris, seventh on the list, 100; Belfort, lowest, 88. Combining rent and prices in the relation of 1 for rent and 5 for prices (owing to the lower rents paid in France for accommodation markedly inferior to that in England or in Germany) Marseilles again stands first, 112; Paris and Calais bracketed second, 100; Brest and Bourges at the bottom, 83.

Wages are perceptibly higher in Paris than in the provinces, where skilled men in the building and engineering trades earn about two-thirds of the Paris rates. This is also true of municipal employees. Unskilled men and compositors generally earn about three-fourths of the Paris rates. The range of wages for a French bricklayer is from 21*s.* 7*d.* to 28*s.* 10*d.* for a full week in summer as against 37*s.* 6*d.* to 40*s.* 6*d.* in England.

The general conclusions arrived at are that the French workman spends rather less in rent than the English workman, that the general level of prices corresponds fairly closely to the German prices for corresponding commodities, that the French artisan's wages in the selected trades are about three-fourths of those of the English artisan and his hours of labour from 13 to 23 per cent. higher, so that his hourly earnings on the average are to those of the English workman performing the

same duties approximately as 64 to 100. The English workman migrating to France and maintaining his English habits would find his expenditure on rent and the main articles of food increase by about 14 per cent.

BELGIUM.

The investigations in Belgium extended to 15 towns with an aggregate of about 1,680,000 inhabitants; 1859 family budgets for a 'normal' week were utilised, but the attempt to collect prices for October 1905, which had become increasingly difficult, was at length abandoned, and the prices used were for June 1908. Excluding Brussels and Antwerp (the latter, so far as the working classes are concerned, a Flemish city) the remaining towns show markedly racial characteristics according to whether they are Walloon or Flemish. The centres of the metal, coal-mining, glass, and small-arms industries are in the Walloon districts, in the south-east; whilst the centres of the textile trades are, with the exception of Verviers, in the Flemish districts. Cheap travel, workmen's trains, and light railways enable urban workmen to live at some distance from their place of employment. The predominant range of weekly rents is:

TABLE XIII.

Two rooms	Three rooms	Four rooms
1/9 to 2/3	2/2 to 2/10	2/8 to 3/6

In Brussels the mean rent of tenements of two rooms (more than two seldom occupied by the working classes) is 3s. 0½d. In Antwerp the averages are for two rooms 3s. 2½d.; three, 3s. 9½d.; and four, 4s. 3d. Tenement houses are important only in Antwerp, Brussels, Verviers, where the building land is strictly limited by the steep slopes of the river valley which hem it in, and in parts of Charleroi, Liège, and Tournai. What has been said of sanitation and water supply in French dwellings applies with equal force to Belgium. At Brussels 100, and Antwerp 99, rents are much the same; at Liège 88, at Ghent (the fourth town in size) 63, Turnhout 44, Paturages 43. Excluding Belgium and Antwerp the Walloon towns average 67, the Flemish 59. Local taxation offers the same difficulty of estimation as in France. It is not included in the figures given above and rarely falls directly to any appreciable extent upon the working classes.

Arranging the families in groups at intervals of 5s. according

to their weekly incomes, the number of children living at home varies from group to group thus :

TABLE XIV.

Weekly income	Under 20/-	20/- and under 25/-	25/- and under 30/-	30/- and under 35/-	35/- and under 40/-	40/- and over
Average No. of children	2.16	2.32	2.52	2.96	3.27	3.94

The joint contribution of wife and children to the family income ranges from 30.2 to 50.8 per cent. in the three highest income classes.

The consumption of bread increases from group to group, 27.26 lbs. a week in the first class to 48.12 lbs. in the last. Flour averages less than 1 lb. a week. Potatoes rise from 29 lbs. in the lowest to 42 $\frac{1}{3}$ lbs. in the highest group, and in each group approach very closely in weight to the consumption of bread. The Walloon towns consume slightly more bread, the Flemish towns considerably more potatoes. Horseflesh accounts for more than 10 per cent. of the total consumption of meat and in Antwerp rises to 19 per cent. Wheaten bread of good quality is generally eaten, and ranges in price from 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. and 4d. to 5d. and 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per 4 lbs. Milk is very cheap, usually 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. a quart, in one case as low as 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ d.

The average weekly consumption of a workman's family is :

TABLE XV.

Coffee . . .	1 lb.	Potatoes . . .	33 lbs.
Sugar . . .	1 lb.	Flour . . .	$\frac{3}{4}$ lb.
Bacon . . .	$\frac{3}{4}$ lb.	Bread . . .	34 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs.
Eggs . . .	7	Milk . . .	8 pints
Cheese . . .	$\frac{1}{2}$ lb.	Meat . . .	4 $\frac{1}{4}$ lbs.
Butter . . .	2 $\frac{1}{4}$ lbs.	Coals . . .	1 $\frac{1}{3}$ cwt.

Local variations in prices are not wide—Brussels and Verviers 100, and only one city (Bruges 89) lower than 92. Rent and food alike are dearer in the Walloon towns. The combined index number for rent and prices on the basis of 1 and 5 is Brussels 100, Antwerp 96, gradually diminishing to Bruges 84.

In the building trades wages are highest in Brussels, but the general level of wages is markedly higher in the Walloon than in the Flemish towns. Bricklayers' wages throughout the country range from 20s. 9d. to 24s. a week. For unskilled labourers in the building trades the figure is Brussels 100, Antwerp 96, other Flemish towns 67 to 91, Walloon towns 84 to 100.

The percentages of the family income spent in food by families with incomes between 25s. and 40s. a week are (61 to 64 per cent.) about the same as in the United Kingdom (61 to 66 per cent.), and, *income for income*, the dietary compares very favourably with that of a British family, while the total difference of cost is very small. But it must be remembered that the Belgian workman earns only about 63 per cent. of the wages received by a corresponding workman in this country, and that his hours of work are 21 per cent. greater. His hourly rate of pay is therefore only 52 per cent. of the British rate. His rent, including local taxation, is three-fourths of what is paid by the British workman (whose accommodation is, however, superior) for the same number of rooms. A British workman who migrated to Brussels would find his cost of living diminished by about 6 per cent. excluding rent, or 9 per cent. if rent be included.

Let us now, emerging from the trees, take a look at the wood. Masses of information lie before us, collected at different dates, in different countries, from selected trades. The information as to town housing is very full, and is probably little affected by the lapse of time. But the returns of articles consumed, accounting for some three-fourths of the total expenditure, inspire less confidence. Apart from the fatal flaw of the 'normal week' the quantities consumed (except in Belgium) do not relate to the time at which they are priced. In a period of rising prices such as we are traversing a workman's budget is sensitive to reconstruction. Larger quantities of certain articles will be consumed and smaller quantities of others if the total income remains about the same. Mr. Wicksteed observes, in 'The Common Sense of Political Economy,' that when the temperature is above 40°, the tramps who have twopence in their pockets make a rush on suppers and sleep out; when it is below 40° they flock to the common lodging-houses and go supperless to bed. A rise in the price of meat tends in the same way to change the tactics of the workman's wife, and to bring about a decreased purchase of meat and an increased purchase of cheaper food such as bread, oatmeal, and potatoes. It was forcibly brought home by the Irish famine that the potato as a staple article of diet is doubly dangerous. The crop is precarious, and there is no cheaper substitute to fall back upon. Where the consumption of potatoes is large we have *prima facie* evidence of straitened circumstances.

The depreciation of gold due to the enormous output which has been continuous since the close of the South African War is but another name for a general rise of prices. To such a movement wages adjust themselves sluggishly, and the

workman's first line of defence when his purchasing power is reduced and his readjustments of food have reached a certain point is to retrench on expenditure other than food and rent, thus increasing the percentage spent on those two items. But the rise of prices since 1904, when the British quantities were taken, is not the same in all four countries under consideration so far as the principal articles of domestic consumption are concerned. Different results would therefore have been shown by a synchronous comparison, though the difference would not be great enough to invalidate the conclusion that the British workman in general is better paid, works shorter hours, and is better housed than the corresponding workman in Germany, France, and Belgium. The range of prices proves that he has a greater command over the necessities and comforts of life, but not always a better dietary than the comparatively few continental workmen who enjoy an equal family income.

When we turn to 'condition' or standard of comfort, we meet with other factors besides the cost of living. Happiness does not entirely, or indeed mainly, depend upon material circumstances. But even on 'the kitchen side of things' it behoves us in international comparisons to be very wary in our conclusions. The relative values of the domestic efficiency of the British, German, French, and Belgian housewife—how are they to be equated? The influence of the sun upon the cost of living may be easily underrated. In a climate like ours woollen garments, shelter for the head, and a meat diet make heavier demands upon the purse than in sunnier lands where a cotton blouse is sufficient, where women go bareheaded, and a hearty meal is made from macaroni, or a piece of bread seasoned with garlic. A Lancashire operative may work for fewer hours but he works with greater intensity than a Marseilles bricklayer. He 'takes it out of 'himself' at work, and football matches and music-halls are a common form of his necessary relaxation. The more leisurely Southerner can economise his housing accommodation by sitting on a chair outside his door or taking a stroll in the cool of the day. His drawing-room is out of doors. His straw hat and well-washed blouse are neater in appearance than the cloth cap and serge suit which cost more money and give greater warmth but are not so easily cleaned. And so the superficial observer who has seen for himself and trusts his own eyes is ready to believe that the foreign workman is as well-to-do as the workman at home.

Since 1896, when wholesale prices generally touched the bottom of a long decline, the rise of prices in this country for

the year 1909 amounts, according to Mr. Sauerbeck's index number, to over 20 per cent., or to the Board of Trade weighted index number to 18 per cent. In the United States the index number of Bradstreet's shows a rise of 47 per cent. In Canada the Department of Labour estimates the increase at 26 per cent. In Germany the increase in the cost of living from 1896 to 1908 has been computed at 27 per cent. In the other countries it is probably greater than the general increase in wholesale prices, and we are thus confronted with the same phenomenon in all countries. We are not at present concerned with the causes of it, though one potent influence has already been mentioned. But in Germany, in France, in North and South America, Governments are being asked by the working classes to 'do something' to deal with the problem. A hungry proletariat looks with critical eyes at frontiers closed to foreign cattle, at tariffs which shut out chilled and frozen meats and cheaper food supplies, and at trusts which it believes to be sheltered by the tariff walls. Our own politicians think it necessary to give assurances that their fiscal proposals will not increase the cost of living of the working classes or cause any addition to the working-man's budget. But what is the cost of living? How is it to be ascertained? And what portion of it represents taxation?

Evidently we cannot answer these questions until we know how the working classes spend their money. The one-fourth of their outgoings unexplored by the Board of Trade includes expenditure on alcohol and tobacco. The figures of the German Blue Book are complete, but they represent the experience of the very elect. The 3575 account books were, no doubt, distributed to steady families, who had no objection to making a full disclosure of their expenditure and were not unwilling to undertake to keep a continuous record. But the 852 who persisted for a whole year are a band of Gideon possessed of the force of character, regularity, method, and industry required to keep a full record of their housekeeping accounts for twelve months. Such families are not average families. They are above the average in the moral qualities which are associated with rational and well-ordered expenditure, and the discipline of account-keeping has in itself a tendency to fortify such a disposition. It may, however, be fairly urged that such budgets as these are the most important, both for the student and the statesman. The fantasies and caprices of wasteful expenditure belong to the morbid side of social pathology. Time may be wasted as well as money, and may result in a contraction of expenditure by diminishing income.

A short Monday is the rule in many Belgian towns. At Liège hundreds of coal-miners keep pigeons in their attics or lumber-rooms.

‘Almost every week-end races take place, organised by the pigeon-flyers’ clubs. Prizes are offered for different classes of birds and much betting takes place among the members. The birds are timed to reach home on Sunday morning, and the club meets in the afternoon or evening to ascertain the winners and distribute the prizes. If, however, the weather is bad the pigeons are delayed and the miners wait for their return on Monday, instead of going to work.’

Budgets which are deflected from the normal in this way are not the best standard for international comparison. What is important is to know how the regular, steady workman is able to provide for his family. If we confine ourselves to food and rent we know but a part of the story. Comfort depends perhaps still more upon the manner in which the rest of the income, the less clamorous fourth of expenditure, is disposed of. Vitality may be depressed by insufficient clothing as well as by underfeeding. The minimum of food required by a shivering man is higher than if he were warmly clad. Many factors of expenditure interact upon each other.

Imagine two families with approximately the same income, and the same expenditure on food and rent. The first family may have a well-furnished home, attend church or chapel regularly, be well provided with books and papers and clothes, and take an annual holiday at the seaside. Of the second it may be sufficient to say that most of its ‘other expenditure’ goes in drink. The partial budget will reveal no difference between the two.

Complete returns are essential for complete comparison. All the budget for all the year is a counsel of perfection, but not impossible of attainment. We want normal budgets not only for different countries but for different localities. Cork, Aberdeen, Norwich will present greater variations than exist between some French and Belgian towns. And the differences between Lille, Paris, Toulouse, and Marseilles will be wider than between some French and German, Spanish, or Italian centres. The heart of the investigator may sink when he finds himself after so much labour unable to offer more precise conclusions. Experience will bring nearer approximation to that exact measurement without which science is a vain thing. The work of the Board of Trade has been immense. It is worth while to continue it and improve it, in view of the supreme importance of the subject.

ART. VII.—MODERN DEVELOPEMENTS IN BALLAD ART.

1. *The Oxford Book of Ballads*. Chosen and edited by ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910.
2. *Ballads and Metrical Tales*. By R. SOUTHEY. London. 1838.
3. *The Defence of Guenevere and other Poems*. 1st ed., 1858, Vol. I. of the Collected Works of William Morris. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1910.
4. *Ballads and Songs* (1894), *New Ballads* (1897), *The Last Ballad* (1899). JOHN DAVIDSON. London: John Lane. etc. etc.

IN the classification of poetry many difficulties arise. Negative rather than positive qualities determine, more often than not, the lines of demarcation. Overlapping characteristics of works, consigned by their general tendency to separate schools and categories, confuse, almost obliterate, theoretical distinctions, and the division into separate groups is frequently a question of the preponderance, not of the exclusive possession, of certain aesthetic elements. So far as ballads are concerned Mr. Quiller-Couch simplifies the question by adopting Professor Ker's definition: 'A Ballad is *The Milldams of Binnorie* and *Sir Patrick Spens* and *The Douglas Tragedy* and *Lord Randal* and *Childe Maurice* and things of that sort,' but he does not thereby greatly elucidate what lies beneath 'the Idea, a Poetical Form, which can take up any matter and does not leave that matter as it was.'

As a fact the term denominating this special class of verse has been applied so indiscriminately that it is difficult to win acceptance for any formal definition. Yet in spite of widest divergences it will generally be allowed that the root of ballad art—according to popular acceptance—lies in the telling of a story; the versification bears the same relation to the story as music bears to the drama in the world of opera. Apart, however, from this broad conception of the fundamental narrative character attached to the ballad, complications of many kinds have been induced by the technical use of the term both in connexion with musical and verse form and with particular verse metres—ballad form and ballad metre indicating certain specialised structural characteristics. On the other hand, the vaguest possible ideas resulted from the circumstance that in earlier days all songs, dissimilar as they

might be in feeling, expression, and structure, passed muster under one heading. 'Ballad—a song' is Johnson's terse definition. And the designation included the Song of Solomon ('The 'Ballad of Ballads'), the rhymed chronicles of Chevy Chase, and the comic-dialogue stanzas of 'Bell my Wife and her Goodman.' Recent poets have availed themselves of the same latitude of nomenclature: Goethe's most famous lyric, 'Kennst du das 'Land,' where the narrative element is totally absent, appears amongst his Balladen. The hybrid title of Lyrical Ballads has covered many equally non-narrative nineteenth-century ballad-variants. Mr. Swinburne's volume, 'Poems and 'Ballads' contains only two strictly narrative poems, 'Les 'Noyades' and 'The Leper' and some few translated or imitative folk-ballads, the 'Ballad of Life' and the 'Ballad of Death,' with their allegoric figures, recalling in form and atmosphere the *canzoni* of early Italian poets and belonging as little to the English ballad convention as the Italian *ballata* or the *ballade* of French verse.

Nor, if, with minds perplexed by divers interpretations, it is difficult to give a positive definition, to say what a ballad is, is it a much easier matter to say what ballads are not. Obviously they are not epic in tone. Professor W. P. Ker* devoted a chapter to the distinction in kind existing between the simplest of northern epics and the most dignified of northern ballads; between the statuesque majesty of the spirit of epic and the coloured vitality of popular narrative; between the statelier rhetoric of the one and the graphic homeliness of the other. But the themes of epic and ballad are often identical, and the distinction, on close analysis, remains a matter of style, temper, and of the general effect induced by the use of facile rhymes and metres and by—to some extent—the condensation required in ballads, of which the length, although indeterminate, tends to greater brevity. Again, if ballads are alien in spirit to the epic, it is not admissible to rank them amongst lyrics. Sentiment ornate or simple, as in pastoral poetry, is an essential lyric motive, and subjectivity is as clearly a feature of lyrical as the converse quality is of ballad poetry. Nevertheless the strain of lyricism in many a ballad prevails over the narrative quality, and once more the group-division is obscured. From other poetic forms, from the Ode, the Sonnet, which lend themselves to the expression of thought and exclude the narrative element, the ballad

* 'Epic and Romance,' W. P. Ker. Macmillan & Co., London, 1897.

stands manifestly apart. Yet in modern days thought and reflexion, the psychology of human lives and events, have insinuated themselves into the balladist's art, and not seldom he tells his story only to make known to his readers what he thinks about it.

Popular instinct, however, indifferent as always to the exact scholarship of learning, has in the main evolved a fixed ideal derived from the primitive ballad literature of the people, where the normal convention was rhythmical narrative, plentifully interspersed with dialogue. The folk-ballad was usually a story told from without, concrete, objective, dealing with events real, imaginary, or traditional, as chronicles of the irrevocable past.* More rarely the ballad of direct narrative was superseded by the ballad of dramatic action, where dialogue or monologue constituted the sole fabric of the verse, where the action was transposed from past to present and the scene gained the acuteness of accent belonging, not to the unchangeable page of the 'has been,' but to the poignant expectation of the moment's happenings and the sharp suspense of the uncertain end.† More rarely still the lyrical ballad (defined as ballads where sentiment dominates, though without supplanting, incident and action) was represented in verses where fictitious personages recounted the fortune, ill or good, of their life-days.‡ Themes, treatment, length, metre varied; the method ranged from narrative pure and simple to dramatic or lyric presentment, but a story by direct statement, or by lucid implication, was the necessary basis of the ballad-maker's verse. It should be added that the appeal in the mass (ballad-dirges, laments, and coronachs were exceptions to the rule) was the elementary appeal not primarily to sympathy but to curiosity. What the story was about, what happened, how it ended, not what poet or audience felt in recounting or hearing it, was the groundwork of the interest. Attention was concentrated upon actions, their causes and consequences: there was little or no inclination, save when the lyric tendency gained supremacy, to dwell upon passive emotions. Further, the attitude towards the outward framework, the scenery and background of events and persons,

* 'Sir Patrick Spens,' No. 75, book iii.; 'Clerke Saunders,' No. 27, book i.; 'Thomas the Rhymer,' No. 1, book i. etc.

† 'Edward, Edward,' No. 65; 'Lord Randal, my son,' No. 66, etc.

‡ 'Helen of Kirconnel,' No 152; 'O Waly, Waly,' No. 87, etc.

was emphatically non-descriptive. Nature, earth, landscape, except in so far as the forces and elements of nature decided the issues of action (the storm wrecking Sir Patrick Spens or the Annan Water flood, with the bordering ²salloy boughs which broke in the hand of the drowning lover), occupied as little space in the scheme of ancient balladists as did the psychological aspects of the human dramas.

The ballads of the great ballad revival period, dating from the second half of the eighteenth century, under the influence of Bürger (b. 1748) and Walter Scott (b. 1771), exhibited a decided inclination merely to revivify the conventions of these models. Folk-poetry had become the object of scholarly research, it became also the subject of aesthetic enthusiasm. Percy's 'Reliques,' the source of Bürger's inspiration, was published in 1765. Other collections of kindred nature multiplied.* And the anonymous compositions originally transmitted and diffused by itinerant singers, recast by *jongleur*, minstrel, gleeman, whether romantic as 'The Jolly Goshawk,'† dimly historic as the Douglas group,‡ ballads of love, war, and notably of supernatural adventure,§ became the established pattern.

The Imitative Ballad thus formed from the first a group of its own. To this group poets adhered who by taste and temperament clung to medievalisms—Bürger and Uhland in Germany, Scott in England, Hugo in France; other poets according to the caprice of the hour adding in one guise or another to the store. Their effort was to mould from the death-mask of the past new effigies of old type-figures, to reclothe the dusty skeleton of antiquity from the stage-wardrobe of pseudo-chivalry. The spirit with which they re-animated their picturesque automata was, with the outward garb, a spirit resuscitated from the graveyards of romance. And it is from the starting point of what may be classified as the Imitative Ballad that the developements of ballad literature must be traced as they passed from phase to phase, introducing or accentuating novel elements, and expressing at each new stage the tendencies to which modern art was subjected during the earlier decades, at the middle, and at the close of the nineteenth century.

* Herd's 'Ancient and Modern Scottish Songs,' 1769. Scott's 'Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border,' 1802-1903. Jamieson's 'Popular Ballads and Songs,' 1806. Finlay's 'Ballads,' 1808, etc.

† Bk. ii. No. 60.

‡ Bk. vi.

§ Bk. i.

I.

Chief amongst English bards as echoist and copyist of ancient strains, Sir Walter Scott proclaimed his allegiance to tradition. To innovations he lent no countenance. His personages walk suitably clad in knightly armour or doublets of Lincoln green, their vocabulary is the diction of nineteenth-century pseudo-chivalry, their sentiments are in strict harmony with those dear to minstrelsy, their themes are identical in kind. As copies they are fraught with clear romantic colouring, as echoes they are resonant with the voices of the past. 'Once or 'twice,' Mr. Quiller-Couch allows, 'he [Scott] came near to distil 'the essence of his models.' Yet whether it be in the work of Scott, or in the few serious ballads of Southey ('Rudiger,'* 'Donica,' 'Lord William,' etc.), or in Campbell ('Lord Ullin's Daughter,' 'Earl March,')† the early group of Imitative Ballads, no less than the ballads of frankly modern accent, carry the indelible impress of their epoch, and indicate beyond misapprehension the gulf dividing the old from the new. 'The studied simplicity, the deliberate archaisms, the overstrained vigour or pathos of these modern ballads, do but 'convince us that the vein is well-nigh worked out.‡ The qualities from which the ballads of simpler ages derived their unique interest are lacking. The rugged savagery, the admixture of unconscious realism, the virility, the instinctive veracity of observation in things patent to the eye, give a vitality to folk-ballad neither Scott, Southey nor Campbell could approach. The sinister, cynical grotesque of the 'Twa Corbies,'|| the discourse by the corpse of the forsaken knight—his hound has gone to hunt, his hawk to fly, his lady to seek a new mate, 'sae we may make our dinner sweet'; the sullen remorse of the parricide in the 'Edward, Edward,'¶ with its crescendo of passion, and the climax, when by a hint the key of the whole story is indicated:

'The curse of hell frae me sall ye bear,
Mither, Mither,
Sic counsel ye gave me, O!'

'The Douglas Tragedy'*** when halting to drink of the 'wan

* A strange misinterpretation of the Lohngryn legend.

† Campbell's Poetical Works.

‡ 'The Balladists,' by J. Geddie. London, 1896.

|| Bk. iii. No. 67.

¶ No. 65.

*** Bk. ii. No. 39 (quoted from Allingham's 'Ballad Book').

'water,' Margaret bends over the stream and one brush-stroke draws a streak of exact colour across the gloom :

" "Hold up, hold up, Lord William," she said,

"I fear me you are slain."

" 'Tis but the shadow of my crimson cloak

That shows in the water sae plain " —

these are presentments of contemporary passions, of a living present, no modern pen can, through any gift of imitative ability, hope to rival.

And to pass to another section, no modern imaginative faculty can effectually reproduce the actuality of the centuries of faith when they indited their ballads of supernatural adventure. The voice of fear palpitates in the verses that tell of the spectres of the Wild Hunt ; of lovers revenant whose dead lips kiss with the scent of the mould on them ; of ghost-ships havening in hell ; of the guile, the ever-present menace, of forest- and water-spirits, luring men to the black depths of haunted woodlands or the cold entombment of deep waves.

But for Scott, for the modern mind at large, the savagery of medievalism was only a memory, the voice of fear was the echo of an echo. Scott's passions are mummies, they have not even the animation of ghosts. His constant pre-occupation by the past paralysed his hand. When he strove after the tragic intensity of folk-ballad ('It was an English 'ladye bright,' 'Rosabelle') or in his transcriptions of foreign and ancient verse, the effects are thin and falsified by an innate tameness. And only in another key did his special genius, his mastery of lucid statement, his accomplished skill and fluency of versification, proclaim his true vocation in the lyrical lilt of 'Brigial Banks,' the gaiety of 'Young Lochinvar,' or in the swinging rhythm of the outlaw ballad 'Allan-à-Dale,' where the sound of youth's light footfall, the freshness of spring's voices, ring in the facile rhymes :

'Allan-à-Dale has no faggot for burning,

Allan-à-Dale has no furrow for turning,

Allan-à-Dale has no fleece for the spinning,

Yet Allan-à-Dale has red gold for the winning.'

In the art of the Imitative Ballad Scott adhered closely to the original idea. Upon Southey, whose ballads fill a whole volume, the past had relaxed its hold. And remote as his ballads now seem from the ballads of later developments, they must be accepted as almost the initial attempt, in England, at a voluntary modernisation of ballad literature.

His method is still strictly narrative; he deals no less than the ancient ballads with themes of human brutality and supernatural adventure. But he abjures archaisms, the language is unaffectedly of his own generation, and the stories not infrequently are drawn from current or recent incidents. Moreover whatever be the subject, the legend of grey Charlemagne and his dead leman, or the Tale of Mary the Maid of the Inn and its prosaic surroundings of local crime, the treatment displays, unmasked, the contemporary temper of mind and feeling. Charlemagne's sombre tragedy becomes a coarse burlesque. 'The Witch of Berkeley,' 'The Surgeon's Warning' are sordid parodies of terror, where the summoning of a panic-stricken soul to hell and the rifling of graves afford—it is a question of taste—poor matter for jesting. Once, however, in telling of the fate of the evil bishop whom rats devoured, the poet strikes a genuine and legitimate chord of horror, and the humourist's laugh is grim as he makes Hatto cognisant of his approaching doom by the scream of the conscience-stricken cat:

'He listened and looked; it was only the Cat . . .
For she sat screaming mad with fear
At the army of rats that were drawing near.'

Supernaturalism with Walter Scott was a formal convention of romance. Ridicule in the sphere of faith, jocosity in relation to horror, were alien to his aesthetic breeding; there is no more trace of either in his works than in 'The Ancient Mariner' or Keats's 'La Belle Dame sans Merci.' Southey's supernaturalism was no convention, but it suffered from a mortal complaint—he could not believe in it. Scott's unbelief was passive, reluctant; Southey's scepticism was active. With both imagination was inadequate to supply vital force to invention. Neither poet could achieve the compromise Goethe triumphantly effected in his 'Erlkönig.' No decadence of credulity dilutes the sense of panic preluded by the first line 'Who rides so fast?' Changed beyond recognition the northern folk-tale, 'Herr Oluf,' was ground in the mill of genius. Opposing forces of belief and disbelief are linked together with such veracity of imaginative power that their fusion is imperceptible. The terror of the poem is the logical terror of half-belief; terror of the reason that denies, of the nerve that quivers. The frenzy of dread is as real as it is unsubstantial. The child sees the menacing form in the darkness; the man the swathes of mist amid the trees. The child hears the whisper of the formidable pursuer; the man

the rustle of the night-wind in dry leaves. A heritage of superstition has set its mark on the child's unripe fancy. The man has outgrown childhood's alarms but fear rides beside him, and, whether it be the stroke of the Erlking or the hand of Fear, 'In seinen Armen das Kind war todt.'

Genius alone by skill or accident could so combine the contraries of faith and unfaith, and it is difficult to recall parallel examples in English verse. For the most part supernaturalism, with the cruder barbarities of primitive passions, would seem to have passed out of the region of modern ballad art. And if Scott lives as a balladist by his lighter efforts, Southey survives mainly by the familiar 'Inch-cape Rock,' of which the scene-painting,

' No stir in the air, no stir in the sea,
The ship was as still as ship could be,'

carried out from start to close forestalls the introduction of the descriptive treatment destined soon in great measure to supplement the narrative method of older ballad-makers. It was the method which in Campbell's 'On Linden when the sun 'was low,' in Coleridge's 'Ancient Mariner,' in Keats's 'Belle Dame,' led onwards to the further developements of emphasised pictorialism represented, at its culminating excellence, by the early ballads of Alfred Tennyson and in those of William Morris and Dante Gabriel Rossetti.*

II.

Before, however, the ballad approached its pictorial climax, and during the first half of the nineteenth century, verses admitting of classification as Commemorative Ballads inaugurated a side-group to which poets of all schools have largely contributed. Cowper's eighteenth-century 'Loss of the *Royal George*' is the earliest modern example of ballads where the appeal is exclusively to popular sympathy in relation to national life. And in the '*Royal George*,' the story told with bare outline of the ship that survived and the eight hundred men who sank, has all the unadorned dignity of a Folk-Lament. It was followed by many kindred compositions dealing, usually in narrative form or in personal reminiscence, with public events

* Amongst late Ballads of Imitation Charles Kingsley's 'Earl Haldane's Daughter,' George Macdonald's 'Halloween' and 'The Yerl of Waterdeck,' Rossetti's 'Stratton Water,' may be named as type-ballads remaining subject to the laws of unwritten tradition.

The inspiration of these poems is drawn from without, the poet's mission is to express rather than to evoke feelings common to the classes or races whose prowess he celebrates. A story, or more usually, an anecdote, is related, but the teller relies for response on some widespread sentiment of the multitude. Love of country, professional pride of soldier or sailor, loyalty to blood and descent, avowedly or by implication constitute the underlying motive of the verse; and beneath the subject-matter the subject-sentiment is always discernible.

With memorable exceptions, from Campbell's * 'Battle of the Baltic' to the period of Tennyson's 'The Revenge,'† it must be acknowledged that the field has proved one where poetic talents have been worsted. Nor, again with exceptions, can the school represented by younger poets of patriotic proclivities and belligerent insularity be appraised as rising above the levels of verse-journalism. Possibly communal enthusiasm when it transcends the boundaries of primitive utterance also passes out of the sphere of aesthetic expression; possibly there exists an inherent incongruity in culture-transcriptions of sentiments—impressive as such sentiments may be in the region of crude elementary emotionalism—that emanate from the crowd. It is certain that poetic diction detracts from, instead of enhancing, the effect in all such ballads. 'The Battle of the Baltic' survives in anthologies, but whatever may be its merits few can fail to appreciate the weakness of the final phrase of fanciful platitude which terminates the somewhat conventional realism of the sea-fight narrative:

'Soft sigh the winds of heaven o'er their graves'
While the billow mournful rolls
And the mermaid's song condoles,
Singing glory to the souls
Of the brave.'

Such lines contrast with the close, at once so gravely dignified and so simple, of the same poet's 'Hohenlinden':

'Few, few shall part where many meet,
The snow shall be their winding sheet,
And every turf beneath their feet
Shall be a soldier's sepulchre.'

Recent balladists—Mr. Kipling, Mr. Masfield,‡ the occasional brutality of whose verses was not needed to enforce the

* B. 1777; d. 1844.

† Published in 1880.

‡ 'Salt Sea Ballads,' by John Masfield. London.

sense of tragic veracity—frequently evade the dilemma by the use of class dialects. It is, however, an open question whether this use of sea and barrack-room jargon does not correspond to the artificiality of adopted archaisms, while it may be conjectured that, as a general rule, neither soldier nor sailor, were he skilled in the art of verse-making, would of choice employ the language into which both poets translate his sentiments.

Public feeling in the abstract was more fortunate in its interpreters when ballad commemoration added the accent of personal to that of popular sentiment, when the theme in its upper current is of homage paid to individual heroism. Where the spirit of a nation is embodied in a single representative and the subject is an isolated dramatic or emotional incident in the life or dying of this or that hero, where the ballad becomes personal in its appeal as the songs of Jacobite loyalty, the concentration of individual sympathy gives the true ring and accent of passion to the verse, be it the verse of the past or of the present. ‘The Burial of Sir John Moore,’ killed while covering the embarkation of his troops, may be taken as an instance of this joint appeal to personal enthusiasm—devotion to a dead leader, and to impersonal sentiment—the glory of a soldier’s honourable dying. Few laments exceed the force of its emotional reticence, and the descriptive literalism telling how, uncoffined, unshrouded, the fallen hero was laid to rest while the random guns of the enemy broke the stillness—

‘ We buried him darkly at dead of night,
The sods with our bayonets turning ;
By the struggling moonbeam’s misty light
And the lantern dimly burning ’ *—

gives, in its dignity and the total absence of sensationalism and braggart exaggeration, a fitting background to the heavy silence in which strong men mourn their loss.

Again when the idea of race and country is impersonated and Celtic poets celebrate the sorrows and glories of the ‘Black Little Rose,’ the ‘Silk of the Kine’ or ‘Kathleen Ni Houlihan,’ in lyrical outbursts, in dirge and lament, the sense of human passion, of the heart-beats of loves and hatreds, or of the slow pulse of grief, suffers no diminution.

Further, explain it how we will, it is in the nature of things that tragedy should lend itself to the service of art after a fashion unknown to joy. Ballads of old were no exception,

* Charles Wolfe (b. 1791), ‘Burial of Sir John Moore at Corunna.’

the catastrophes of life were nearly invariably their preferred themes.* And still failure, disaster, not triumph and success, have inspired the noblest strains of the commemorative ballad. 'The Charge of the Light Brigade' will outlive the records of many a victory. There are no doubt contrary examples. Browning's 'How they brought the good news from Ghent to Aix,' or even Longfellow's national ballad of 'Paul Revere's Ride'†—

'A hurry of hoofs in a village street,
A shape in the moonlight, a bulk in the dark,
And beneath, from the pebbles, in passing a spark
Struck out by a steed flying fearless and fleet.
That was all! And yet through the gloom and the light
The fate of a nation was riding that night'—

can be justly quoted on the other side. Yet from the time when Heine, whose balladist genius has been eclipsed by his lyric fame, gave expression to the most impassioned outburst on record of personal and national devotion to a defeated Chief, in his dramatic-dialogue ballad of 'Die Grenadiere' (a ballad which associated with Schumann's music and the vibrating rhythm of the 'Marseillaise' has attained European renown), the commemoration of heroic calamity has, by virtue of some generous instinct implanted in human nature, taken poetic precedence of the poems which celebrate the deeds of conquerors. And possibly the war-verses of journalistic poetry owe their frequent accent of boastful complacency to non-conformity with such instinctive promptings, no less than to forgetfulness that, in Owen Meredith's phrase, victory is not seldom 'crime praised on earth for successful results,' and that the glory of the conqueror lies not in the combat but in the cause. Else, to quote his ballad of 'A Defeated Army':

'Graves are better than crowns thus. Oh ever and ever
This bartering Eternity's birthright to Time!
God, we give Thee, unblemished, our frustrate endeavour;
Earth, we leave thee, unchallenged, thy share in man's crime.'

III.

Leaving on one side the Commemorative Ballad, the growth and expansion of the descriptive tendency, leading to the purely pictorial method, may be signally traced in one of the most

* John Geddie.

† Paul Revere carried warning of the march of the British troops to his countrymen, April 18, 1775.

prolific of balladists, Longfellow. Developements in poetry override chronological order, and the American laureate, notwithstanding the date of many of his later publications, occupies an intermediate place between poets belonging characteristically to the first decades and those belonging definitely to the latter half of the nineteenth century. His work moreover serves as a connecting-link, for like Scott he employed his talents to a very considerable extent in imitation and translation, and although no truer semi-paradox has often been hazarded than Edgar Allan Poe's assertion that 'imitators are 'not necessarily unoriginal,' it is decidedly in a reversion to the spirit of the past that Longfellow's ballads gain in vitality. As Imitative Ballads they lost the tone of didacticism which, however slightly indicated, vitiates aesthetically so large a section of his finest poetic production. The narrative cycle drawn from the Scandinavian legends of the *Heimskringla*, 'The Saga of 'King Olaf,' show both the strength and weakness of his endeavours. They do not, in truth, convey the inimitable power of savage and sinister realism appertaining to ancient story, nor are they ever—as the old sagas are—rifted by flashes of imaginative vision and supernatural terror. The insatiable vengeance-lust, the ruthless valour-worship, the invulnerable fatalism of early northern epic, were characteristics setting them at an immeasurable distance from the romance-world of chivalry upon which Scott, with far greater facility, modelled his inventions. They were features that lent themselves grudgingly to reproduction. In the hands of a Wagner the stern epic note was submerged in the floodtide of vari-coloured romanticism. Self-conscious passion supplanted the elemental vigour of primitive instincts and impulses. At the hands of a William Morris, equally spell-bound by the magic of the North, an emotional lethargy, in no wise related to the austere acquiescence in fate of the wise, fearless, strong-hearted women who trod the rocks of northern idealism, clings to the loves if not of his heroes certainly of the heroines of his northern tales. The emotional hardihood is lost and the outward energy of passion absorbed in the inner Maelstrom of feeling—the stream cannot flow two ways at once.

And where a Wagner and a Morris failed to resuscitate the soul of that hardy era, when epic hate not romantic love was the motive-passion on which life forged its sword, it was beyond the bounds of probability that the sober, thoughtful, pious American moralist should succeed. Nevertheless, within his own limits he has pictured, not ungraphically, some aspects of northern existence, of its homeliness, its brutalities, its

rough humour, and, in minor degree, of the harsh clash of the conflict which raged between the disciples of the new faith and the priests and people of the old. He has sung of the women who wrought with might against the king of novel doctrines and alien rites, of Sigfrid the Haughty to whom Olaf sent his betrothal ring, gold above, copper beneath, rilled from the shrine of the gods:

‘ She had given the ring to her goldsmiths twain,
Who smiled as they handed it back again ’;

and of the Queen’s fierce question—will Olaf swear, as Odin once swore, *on the Ring*? and of the blow which followed when Olaf wrote his death-day in the page of doom:

‘ Sigfrid the Haughty said under her breath :
“ This insult, King Olaf, shall be thy death.” ’

The story of Gudrun, passing to her bridal-night, a knife hidden at her breast, is likewise told, some directness of touch giving force to his over-fluent verse; and it may be placed beside De Vere’s ‘ Girl Deliverer ’ and Tennyson’s ‘ Sisters ’ ballad, where the same situation is repeated in different phases of poetic development, although it is noteworthy that the daughter of the Gael shows a superior aptitude for death-dealing than the thwarted avengeress of Ironbeard. In the last instance more particularly the modern note obtrudes itself as the mistress of the Saxon lover, whose vengeance is for a private wrong, analyses the psychological complexity of her emotions:

‘ I hated him with the hate of hell,
But I loved his beauty passing well.’

In another section of Longfellow’s ballads, the strictly modern trend towards enlarging the proportion of descriptive passages led him, and many another poet with him, into all the transgressions of protracted word-paintings. Setting theoretically a sharply defined boundary between the narrative ballad of action and the ballad of paramountly emotional sentiment, pictorialism used as a mere accessory, when it is unnecessary to the theme and superfluous to sentimental effect, when it neither conveys a dumb-show presentment of incident nor conduces directly or indirectly to the fermentation of an emotional atmosphere, is as foreign to the primitive ballad-idea as subtleties of rhyme and metre, as rhetorical diction or the enforcement of moral lessons. Mr. Geddie has pointed out the rigid economy of description—description reduced to the briefest conventional formulas—

occurring in ancient ballad-poetry. Longfellow's 'Ballad of 'Carmilhan' illustrates the indulgence at its height, of scenic effects. The landscape treatment is clearly reminiscent of 'The Ancient Mariner' in its association with the fantastic supernaturalism of the spectre-ship theme. No small portion, it may be added, of the elder poet's visionary strength has descended upon the poet of later days as he recounts how the accursed ship of the living sailed the broad seas amid portents of her doom :

'The cabin windows have grown blank
As eyeballs of the dead . . .
And all on board the *Waldemar*
Was still as still could be
Save when the dismal ship-bell tolled.

* * * * *

The sun went down, the full moon rose
Serene o'er field and flood ;
And all the winding creeks and bays
And broad sea-meadows seemed ablaze,
The sky was red as blood.'

But despite intrinsic merits the multiplication of such passages leads to a perception that the scene is degenerating into scenery, and dulls the shock when

'right ahead lay the Ship of the Dead ;
The ghostly *Carmilhan*.'

Between the early descriptive ballad and the advanced pictorialism of the latter decades of the century, although the distinction may appear one more of fancy than fact, there were radical points of difference. Between the pictorial ballad of dramatic narration and the pictorial presentment of emotional narrative there was again a distinction. Goethe's 'König im 'Thule' is a signal instance of the legitimate application of pictorialism to convey dramatic action. His vivid delineation of one solitary act epitomises a whole life-history of passion ; and not by one hair's breadth does the picture overlap the edge of that action. The golden goblet, first the love-pledge, then the sole relic of love, is the central image. The old King drinks from it at every feast—drinking he weeps. Death comes. In his high castle by the sea, surrounded by his vassals, he holds a last carousal : 'upstood the old Reveller, drank the last fire of 'life from the golden cup and cast it to the flood. He watched it 'fall. It filled, it sank ; his eyes closed and never more drank 'he.' Every touch, and not one is wasted, completes the

picture, and the picture is the story. So treated pictorialism adds to the strength without destruction, or disruption, of the structural outline. But such examples are rare, and amongst English poets, as new aesthetic formulas gained ground, the pictorial treatment of ballad themes became more and more closely connected with narratives depending for their interest not upon action but upon emotional emphasis.

'Le poète moderne . . . accepte du paysage qui l'entoure un 'des éléments de son émotion.' * This alliance of sentiment not only with nature but with the outward show and semblance of all things reached its height in the ballads of the Pre-Raphaelite group. To the Pre-Raphaelite poet emotional excitement outbalanced every consideration of action; and, consequently, emotion taking vaguer course than action, structural outline in a majority of instances ceased to exist. The group may be analysed as consisting of narrative poems composed by poets to whom the story served as a thread upon which to string, as variegated beads on a wire, sequences of emotional, combined with sequences of scenic, effects. Nature and the natural world are the looking-glass held up to reflect human passions, and the dominant impression produced upon the reader's mind is not so much of the deeds and episodes chronicled but of a prismatically tinted atmosphere charged with sentimental, sensual, and symbolic suggestions.

Pre-Raphaelite pictorialism overleapt the bounds of action, it retarded the sense of movement, it to a considerable extent obscured apprehension of the course and progress of events related. Directness of statement was lost with the loss of simplicity; unity of colour alone, of primary ballad-requisites, remained intact. Nevertheless if in these ballads the picture has ceased to be the story and the story has become in the more extreme examples a mere auxiliary to the picture, if pictorialism has lost its justification as the dumb-show pantomime of action, it has assumed an important aesthetic office. It has become a main factor by which the emotional atmosphere is created and sustained and through which the desired effects are, in some cases, unquestionably achieved. Tennyson's 'Sir Galahad' (Charles Kingsley assigned to it the first place amongst ballads of his day) illustrates at an early date † the advantage of enhancing the sense of subjective impressions by throwing their shadows upon the material universe, while, in this instance, the structural

* Quoted from V. de Lapradé's 'Sentiment de la Nature,' by Scherer, vol. vi. Paris, 1894.

† Published in 1842.

form is unimpaired. From beginning to end the appeal to the eye is continuous, yet there are few descriptive passages which have not their logical justification in the fact that the outward scenes portrayed reflect the visionary supernaturalism of the legend. The sights, the imagery employed are in accordance with the supernatural insight of the Knight of God and mirror his obsessive passion for things celestial and ethereal. The landscape which he surveys, the apparitions of chapel, shrine and altar, are the outcome of the central idea. Galahad is a soul in quest of the hidden mystery of life spiritual; the dark forest, the lonely mere, the dumb snow wreaths, the wind-blown fens, are for him as full of the intuition of divine presences as the consecrated shrine where

‘ Three angels bear the holy Grail, .
With folded feet, in stoles of white,
On sleeping wings they sail.’

Yet, harmonious as the ‘bodily seeming,’ and the inner mind of the poem may be, it is likewise impossible to be unaware of the demerits of the method. The retardation of movement is very perceptible, the hoofs of the white charger fall slowly while the mail-clad rider takes so heedful a survey of every detail of the scenery he traverses, and all sense of dramatic action flags in proportion to the sense of the dilatory advance. ‘The Lady of Shalott’* outstrips ‘Galahad’ as a phase of pictorial development, and exhibits a still more self-conscious effort to accentuate and supplement sentiment. Many of the stanzas are purely descriptive. Words and rhythm are fastidiously chosen to convey to the ear the dreamy lassitude of the level-lying landscape, and the dreamer within her chamber walls dreams her dreams, as it were, amid a world that lies asleep. Without men idly gaze on the lily-grown water; the weed-spread river winds indolently through flat fields of barley and of corn. Heavy barges drawn by slow-paced horses float silently by. Within the Weaver weaves even as the river flows, ever and ever. The shuttle flits to and fro across the loom. Her gaze is fixed upon the Blue Mirror and upon what is imaged there until the sickness of the unreal falls upon soul and body. Then in one supreme impulse to break the trance which nets her round, in one single endeavour to exchange shadow for substance, she loves and dies—dies a dreamer awakened by the passing of Lancelot’s face, dies drifting down to Camelot of the King, the within and the without alike effaced in the blind neutrality of death.

* Published in 1832.

William Morris and Dante Gabriel Rossetti carried the pictorialism to its extreme point, each with a painter's eye trained to discern the value of every stroke; each, it may be allowed, with forfeiture of dramatic energy and, to a large extent, of structural perfection. For which losses excess of emotional passion, wealth of colour, and in Rossetti's case, a superabundance of rhythmical melody, make due compensation. Swinburne criticised the Morris ballads with the generous appreciation of which he was a spendthrift, but of Morris's Arthurian poems he readily acknowledged that few could be structurally faultier: 'Take 'that one called "Arthur's Tomb." It has not been constructed 'at all; the parts hardly hold together; it has need of joists and 'screws, props and rafters—there is scarcely connexion here and 'scarcely composition—there is scarcely a trace of narrative 'power.* Further (a defect Swinburne has overlooked), many, more especially the Sir Galahad Mystery-ballads, constantly infringe—and Tennyson's 'Galahad' no less than they—the axiom that 'every work should contain in itself all that is necessary for its own comprehension.'† It would be impossible to read these verses with a clear understanding of their themes were the reader not equipped with a considerable knowledge of matter they do not include. Yet, notwithstanding his absolute incapacity for clearness of statement, his redundancy of adjectives and the inconsequence and confusion of action and event, Morris vindicated the gains of pictorialism. Its excellence with him was born of the keen eye that, in accordance with his craft of designer, caught instinctively the line and colour of things and transferred both accurately to his page, giving to his writing the quality of the illuminated margins of medieval manuscripts. Sentence after sentence can be quoted, taken almost at random, to testify to his gift. The portrait:

'There she stands and her yellow hair slantingly
Drifts the same way that the rain goes by'; ‡

the simple image of the armed crowd:

'Whose spears stood like the corn a-row'; §
or the colour-scheme of the old garden:

'On the bricks the green moss grew,
Yellow lichen on the stone
Over which red apples shone . . .' ||

* 'Essays and Studies,' Algernon Swinburne. Chatto and Windus: London.

† Edgar Allan Poe.

§ The Judgement of God.

‡ The Little Tower.

|| Golden Wings.

And even greater than the spontaneous touches that gave shape and hue to his pictures was the skill that filmed his descriptive detail with haze of floating lights and floating dusks. In a manner of his own the environment of his Galahad Mystery is welded into the fabric spiritual and physical of the legend. Morris's Knight of Divine Adventure is seen in the despondency of a faith waxen dim, of a divine passion grown cold. At the threshold of the forest chapel he tells of

' . . . the melted snow that hung in beads
Upon my steel-shoes ; less and less I saw
Between the tiles the bunches of small weeds—'

and the drowsy frost-bound prelude prefaces the vision until like a somnambulist, half wakened, frozen, sleep-blind and soul-weary, he hears the shrill bell rung by unseen hands, and following the sound, he, entering within the chapel, sees

' One sitting on the altar as a throne,
Whose face no man could say he did not know '

(the reticence here of literal description is noteworthy)

' With raiment half blood-red, half white as snow.'

These verses throw us back perpetually from the Without to the Within ; moreover the time-sense induced by the laggard narrative movement gives to transient impulses of passion a subtle semblance of prolongation, to the impetus of action a semblance of duration, as the attention, distracted by the appeal to the eye, recurs to the human sentiment depicted to find emotion still at the same pitch. So it is in the stanza cited by Swinburne, where Guenevere, mad with remorse, arraigns Lancelot in a metaphor as bitter as any love ever wrung from woman's lips :

' Here let me tell you what a Knight you are—
O sickle cutting hemlock the day long !
That the husbandman across his shoulders hangs
And going homeward about evensong
Dies the next morning, struck through by the fangs.'

So it is throughout all the more memorable of the ballads. Nor do the pictures drawn by the hand of Morris ever shatter, by splashes of discursive colour, the unison of tone requisite to ballad art, or deviate from the principle that prohibits the introduction of any scenery or imagery that is not either the reflexion or duplication of the emotional effect purposed.

All the elements incorporated in the Morris ballads, the rich

pictorialism, the emotional intensity, are equally embodied in Rossetti's ballads, where both reached a climax unrivalled in English literature, combined, over and above, with a special psychological quality rare amongst his poetic contemporaries. Whether narrative as 'Rose-Mary,' lyrical as 'An Old Song ended,' or dramatic as 'Sister Helen' (unsurpassed for tragic gloom in the annals of the modern ballad)—Rossetti's ballads * to an extent admitting of no further sane advance are expressed in pictorial formula. This genius for the visualisation of the emotions was displayed to the full in 'Rose-Mary.' Here, as also in 'The Lady of Shalott,' the very nature of the plot exacted a succession of pictures. On the reflexions of things seen in the Blue Mirror, on the mystic sights disclosed by the Beryl Stone, are hinged the chief episodes of the two romances. But whether the picture be vision or reality, figure or landscape, the painting is always the painting of a consummate artist :

'The road runs past me as I look ;
Or it is even as though mine eye
Should watch calm waters filled with sky
While lights and clouds and wings went by.'

And in the skill that links image to image, evolving each from its predecessor in a perfectly harmonious sequence, he stands without peer :

'In the hair dark waved the face lay white
As the moon lies in the lap of night ;
And as night through which no moon may dart
Lies on a pool in the woods apart
So lay the swoon on the weary heart.'

Emotionalism nevertheless outbalanced the pictorialism to which it was wedded in those poems most penetrated by Rossetti's individuality as man and as artist. If 'The Blessed Damozel' may be allowed to rank (as Goethe ranked 'Mignon's Song') amongst lyrical ballads, it might be accounted a perfect example of purely emotional narrative conveyed by an almost purely pictorial treatment. Picture succeeds picture while the verses retail each fluctuation of longing and of rapture in the soul of the star-crowned denizen of the Paradise of God as she awaits the coming of the lover whom life still holds captive below. Passion touches every string of the harp ;

* 'The White Ship' and 'The King's Tragedy' are more or less exceptions.

ecstasy of anticipated joy in reunion to come, sadness of deferred hope, serenity of expectancy finally displaced by the access of present desire, of the heart's desire that cleaves with a cry the ethereal harmonies of eternity when, with one gesture of imperative human distress,

‘ . . . she cast her arms along
The golden barriers
And laid her face between her hands,
And wept (I heard her tears).’

The fragmentary ‘Bride’s Prelude’ is an instance of this emotional element carried to an extreme where the core of sentiment is no longer passion but disease. The broken confession made by the elder to the younger sister, of the shame that has laid stagnant at her heart, transports us from regions of emotional sanity into fever-wards of passions that coil and recoil upon themselves in circles from which there is no outlet in action and no appeasement in utterance. It was Rossetti’s preoccupation with the psychological aspects of such situations that set him at the farthest possible remove from the frank moral neutrality of the medieval ballad, where love decreed its own canon-law and right and wrong were interchangeable terms. In Rossetti’s poems contrariwise emotions not only appear as states of the soul, characters as conditioned and moulded by instincts and circumstances, but both emotions and characters are viewed in relation to certain ethical standards. The epic sense of fatality is supplanted by the sense of human will, with, for inevitable corollary, the consciousness of human responsibility.

To a modified degree William Morris is also, spiritually considered, scarcely less modern in his mood when—despite all his stage-properties, swords, spears, rusty armour reburnished, costumes and furniture disinterred—he analyses the temper of Galahad’s faith or Guenevere’s repentance. In ‘Arthur’s Tomb’ the queen sways from maddened remorse to frenzied regret for pleasure that is past. By a subtle instinct of self-torture she abases her lover to humiliate herself, as the two, who once rode gaily a-maying in the green woodlands, stand face to face above the stone which hides Arthur’s dead face from their ashamed eyes. But if Morris is modern in mood Rossetti is modern to the bone; he writes with fingers pressed upon the pulse of human passion, whether it be in ‘Troy Town,’ with its sensual passion, its physical rapture of beauty and colour; or whether it be in painting the forsaken first wife of Adam, Lilith, whose heart’s hope has become a hatred; Lilith, who plunges the fangs of her

old serpent nature into fresh poison, and stings herself to vengeance with the remembrance of Adam's bygone caresses :

' O but Adam was thrall to Lilith ! . . .
All the threads of my hair are golden,
And there in a net his heart was holden.'

Moreover, in Lilith Rossetti recognised not only a myth but an allegory. ' In her nets,' says Swinburne, ' all the souls of Eve's ' sons are entangled.' Rossetti's Lilith is the image of the Temptress woman who from Eden-ages onwards, under myriad phantasmal semblances, has haunted, for numberless centuries, the dreams, as her mortal embodiments have enmeshed with lures of corruption, the lives, of the children of men. She is the Venus of ' Tannhäuser'; the unrepentant Kundry of ' Parzival'; she is Melusine, and she is Lorelei, Heine's golden-headed siren of the Märchen ' das kommt mir nicht aus dem ' Sinn'; she is every woman whose outward beauty has magnetised the hearts of men blind to their inner treason. And thus, beyond Rossetti's Lilith the abstract idea lies shadowed amidst the surging waves of emotion, amidst the colour-weighted imagery of the poet whose supreme worship was beauty, whose continual search was for splendour of texture, wealth of words, and melody of sound. The ballad-story has proceeded on its way to become ballad-allegory.

IV.

Reviewing once again the departures from tradition, and in especial the deviations from the Imitative Ballad : taking from the works of greater poets familiar examples ; classifying some of the chief developments of the modern ballad (amongst many necessarily omitted) by certain tendencies, by the predominance, emphasis or concurrence of strongly marked features, it would seem that the characteristics of the new as opposed to the old ballad-poetry in the examples thus analysed consist mainly in the elaboration of descriptive passages, in the upgrowth of a definitely pictorial treatment and in the accentuation of sentiment and emotion—the rendering by preference of what is felt to what is done. A yet more radical divergence from past conventions was to manifest itself in the presentment of abstract conceptions, intellectual, philosophical and ethical, in what may be classed separately as allegoric ballads—where the story invites symbolic interpretation—

or as ballads where the story is illustrative of an idea, a feeling or a sentiment, with which it is associated.

In this phase the impulse to revert to the past followed by the Ballad of Imitation was directly counteracted by poets of contrary proclivities, sensitive to the currents of thought appertaining to their age, imbued with the keen sense of individuality belonging to their epoch. These, even when drawing inspiration, colour, incident, from the storehouse of bygone years, translated their themes by force of emotional veracity into the common experiences of contemporary humanity. They verified the type-passions, the type-figures of tradition by pouring into the envelope of antique fashioning the sentiments and speculations of the passing hour. They translated symbols into daily life occurrences; they transposed narratives from the world of stories that once happened into the world of stories that happen hourly :

‘ Märchen noch so wunderbar
Dichterkünste machens wahr.’

Their heroes not infrequently were fictitious presentments of the poet's own personality. Goethe's *Rattenfänger*, like his *Musensohn*, is a statement of his conception of his own—the artist's—vocation. Heine's *Arme Peter* recounts—it was one amongst many such poems—in a ballad-idyll his own love-sorrows.

And this new ballad art, where the story-teller shares with the story told the interest of the reader, is weighted with a continual appeal, not as were the ancient ballads to the somewhat callous curiosity of the childish ages of man, ('they appeal to something young in the national mind *') but to the mature sympathies, to the enlarged sense of sentimental and mental fellowship, to the mutual understanding existing between all members of the human community. The poet-emotionalists courted response from the man of like passions; poet-thinkers claimed a hearing from men of kindred intellectual fibre, whose aesthetic appreciation was not restricted to the appreciation of the senses or the heart. Goethe, with Heine, in Germany, had produced ballads where thought and idea expanded far beyond either the canvas covered by the picture or the concrete example of emotion which afforded the subject-matter of the story. Goethe's '*Schwager Kronos*'—to revert once more to the greatest of modern balladists—might be taken as a type example of the allegoric ballad. In '*Kronos*'

* Quiller-Couch, Preface.

the idea rules supreme. And the vigorously wrought paean of triumphant progress strangely anticipated, severed by an abyss of genius, the hackneyed ballad of sentimental idealism, Longfellow's familiar 'Excelsior,' 'Excelsior' depicted in Edgar Allan Poe's interpretation 'the earnest upward struggle of the soul . . . an impulse not to be subdued even in death.' The theme of 'Kronos' is identical. The incidents of the narrative run on parallel lines with those of the schoolroom romance-verses, which fade into water-colour beside the virile, fiery eloquence of the Goethe stanzas. Jubilant and exultant the youth whom Kronos drives urges his conductor onwards and upwards. With clatter of hoof-falls they gallop 'rasch' 'ins Leben hinein.' Up and on, they mount the rock-tracks where—the philosophical drift of the parable proclaims itself—'from peak to peak the eternal soul floats in the knowledge 'of eternity.' To this traveller also the roadside roof proffers shelter and repose, for him also the welcoming maiden stands upon the threshold. Halting he drinks of life's pleasure, but only to hasten past, till the path descends, the marsh mists gather below. Then—the sunset blaze in his eyes, let Kronos carry him to the doorway of the Dead: 'Sound, Postboy, 'sound your horn, let the hoofs of your horses ring, that Orcus 'may know of our approaching and that the Host may be 'ready to welcome his guest at the gate.'

More congenial, however, to the temper of the modern English poet than the ballad wherein the story is treated allegorically was the ballad where the story illustrates the idea or conveys the impression of an attitude of mind on the part of the teller of the story. The three quatrains of Heine's 'Alte Lied,' narrating, with inimitable condensation, the old tragedy of the Queen's Page, may serve for example.

'There was an old King; heavy his heart, grey his head; the poor old King wedded a young wife.

'There was a gay Page; fair his head, light his mind; he bore the silken train of the young Queen.

'Know you the old story? it rings so sweet, it rings so sad; both must die; too well each loved the other.'

The concise precision of statement, the moral neutrality, the absence of blame, of extenuation, imply clearer than text-book expositions a whole philosophy, fatalist and pessimist, of life and love and of the inevitable laws that regulate human hearts. The underlying thought sways with subtle mastery the emotion and incident, and thus told the old song becomes a story where yesterday and to-day are one. And when we turn to Heine's

treatment of modern life—as in ‘Jammerthal,’* where the ballad recounts succinctly the starvation of two lovers in a city garret, and concludes with a coroner’s report, we have entered a region of aesthetic experiment of which the limits are still undefined and the vein unexhausted. Heine disguised his revolt against human callousness under the mask of mockery; he analysed the ingredients that make the sum of human folly, watching the arena with the ironic assurance: ‘Doch, Geduld! alles hat ‘sein Ende.’ But unique as was his individuality he comes nearer at root to recent phases of English ballad poetry than any amongst the poets of his epoch. The English balladist strikes with a heavy hand the string he touched so fastidiously with sensitive attenuated fingers: in place of the vibrating whisper of his barbed laughter the verses of the spokesman of newer miseries resound with an angry cry, yet he and they alike bring to the fashioning of the ballad minds preoccupied with conceptions moral and spiritual of human dealings, with assumptions that colour every transcript of life and give direction to every emotion. Mid-century poets, Kingsley (‘The ‘merry brown hares came leaping’), Tennyson (‘Rizpah’) in their poems implied definite standpoints of human sympathy. Later poets extract overtly or by implication significances consonant to their individual estimate of good and evil, or, it may be, to their negation of both. To Robert Browning’s ‘The Statue and the Bust’† (though it must perhaps be excluded from ballad literature by its form and atmosphere) such a moral is frankly appended. The Florentine lovers have waited too long the love-hour each desired; age has overtaken their laggard loves. The poet’s commentary closes the story:

‘ . . . my principle,
 Let a man contend to the uttermost
 For his life’s set prize, be it what it will ! . . .
 . . . “ But delay was best,
 “ For their end was a crime.” Oh a crime will do
 As well, I reply, to serve for a test.’

Other poets announced their ‘principle’ less explicitly, but in the typically modern ballads of John Davidson and the more famous ‘Ballad of Reading Gaol’ every page gives evidence of the desire to express and enlist sympathy for certain views concerning the conduct of life, the relationship of man to

* Romanzen und Fabeln.

† R. Browning, ‘Dramatic Romances.’ Works, vol. iv., Smith, Elder and Co., 1879.

man, and the relationship of things as they are to ideals human and divine or again to ideals *à rebours*.

Moral neutrality in literary art has proved itself more a matter of theory than of practice. Standards may be inverted, ideals reversed, but standards abide with us, and, each by his own criterion, poets continue to take the measure of guilt in sins and of worth in virtues, under which two categories men have been content to sort life's moral issues. One after another Mr. Davidson's ballads illustrate some outlook of human or social sympathy. In the 'Ballad of Hell' a man and a woman elect to die. Their rendezvous in hell is kept by the woman alone; her lover false to his tryst has taken another mate. The woman, 'long believing,'

'Took root in hell's midst all alone
And waited for him there.'

Then, assured of his treachery, resolutely

'She marched across the floor of hell,
And all the damned stood up to see'

as she climbed the stair of a heaven where seraph and saint 'welcomed that soul that knew not fear.* The same insistence on an eternal justice that repays all striving, be the strife for love or for the great work of a noble art, is summed up in the twin 'Ballad of Heaven.* The musician who has died heart-broken between starved wife and child, his finished symphony yet unscored, stands trembling for his sins of selfish endeavour at God's door. He 'has not long to wait,' the door opens, while the melody that greets his ears is the full achievement of his dreams:

'He doubted; but God said "Even so
Nothing is lost that's wrought with tears,
The music that you made below
Is now the music of the spheres."'

Nor, in retelling ancient legends does he depart from the attestation of a moral attitude. His 'New Ballad of Tann-*'häuser'* is, he states, 'not only the most modern but the most 'humane interpretation of the world-legend with which it deals.' The sentence illuminates the intentional preponderance of the ethical element in his art, exhibited yet more overtly in his version of the legend of the wandering nun whose place has

* Ballads and Songs.

been taken, during her pursuit of human passion, by the Queen of Heaven. The sinner returns to the convent with bleeding feet, the fire of the heart burnt to ashes, her beauty changed to haggardness, the gold hair silvered with misery. The Mother of God greets her with words of absolution; in following the laws of Nature she has attained divine fellowship:

‘ Sister to the mountains now
And sister to the day and night,
Sister to God.’

Davidson, it would seem, dwelling persistently on the ‘stricken body of this death called life’ and upon the soul of things seen, made confession in and out of season of a creed which governed his poetic faculty: his ballads are poems of revolt, of convictions and ideals; ballads of pity and death, appealing from the law of man to the justice of God, from the immense cruelties of ignorance to the infinite mercies of knowledge.

Far beyond them in aesthetic skill, equally definite as a masterpiece of poetry with a purpose, is the ‘Ballad of Reading Gaol.’ The story, if story it can be called, is reduced to a minimum so far as narrative action is concerned. One single stanza states for what crime perpetrated a prisoner stands condemned to die: ‘The man had killed the thing he loved.’ More than one hundred stanzas record the impressions of his fellow-prisoners and describe in painful detail the incidental circumstances of a prison execution. The gist of the whole poem is an extension of the plea ‘let him that is without ‘sin’ make an outcast of the criminal. For audience the poet takes the conscience of his fellow-men—the guilt of one is the guilt of all:

‘ For each man kills the thing he loves.
By each let this be heard.
Some do it with a bitter look,
Some with a flattering word,
Some do the deed with many tears,
And some without a sigh:
For each man kills the thing he loves,
Yet each man does not die.’

The ‘Ballad of Reading Gaol’ as a type-ballad may fitly close the list of fresh experiments or retrogressive movements in the history of the modern movement. Ethical and psychological complexities have undoubtedly encroached upon an art of which simplicity was once the hall-mark of merit. What

further experiments may be essayed, what further recessions may befall, in ballad art is a matter of conjecture. What losses and what gains, what forfeitures of special ballad qualities : clearness of statement, precision of structure, unity of colour and unity of theme, have been incurred, and what compensations have resulted for such forfeitures, critics will estimate each according to his own scale of aesthetic worth. As a whole—in its broadest aspect—it may be said that the trend of modern ballad art implies an active recognition that imaginative poetry is not necessarily an incursion into the realms of fantastic invention ; that, in truth, imagination is an extension of reality and must, perforce, include what it expands. It may perhaps be added—again on broad lines—that if the modern ballad has succeeded in investing themes drawn from actuality with imaginative qualities, it has failed in the converse power of investing themes drawn from the imagination with reality.

ART. VIII.—THE 'RIGHT TO WORK.'

THE object of this article is to state and to examine the claim, recently made in certain quarters, and definitely formulated in the Unemployed Workmen Bill of 1908, that every workman not in employment has a right to work. But, first of all, it may be admitted that the intention of such a claim and the aim of such a measure as that indicated cannot but win the sympathy of every good citizen. For the principle underlying the position taken up is that the welfare of every being in the community depends upon his finding an opportunity to realise the energies he possesses. Not simply on economic grounds—for economic reasons after all give a very partial interpretation of any man's life—but on the grounds of the inherent worth of every human personality, it is essential that the activity a man possesses should have scope. The measure of the worth of a human personality is to be found in the completeness of the expression of the ends of his being; and if such expression is seriously impeded, he becomes degraded in his own eyes as well as in the eyes of his fellows. Work, labour, is one of the most universal and essential ways in which personality is realised; it is one of the chief ways by which a man recognises and embodies the purposes of his life, one of the main forms in which he really knows what he is, and by which he becomes recognised and accepted by his fellows. What he does is done as a member of a community, is valuable because it is a contribution to the common good of his society; and this value so obtained reacts upon the worker, and establishes his own sense of his own worth in his own eyes. To belong to a community and to live for it is to attain human good; if therefore a man is prevented by any cause from contributing his share to the common stock (and he is so prevented when he is denied the privilege of work, of 'doing' something), then to that extent the attainment of the true good of man is denied to him.

No one therefore can fail to sympathise with the motive of the claim we are considering. It involves a sound ethical principle, and is inspired by a true idea of the significance of manhood and citizenship.

We may also confess our sympathy with this attempt to meet a deplorable condition of affairs in modern industrial communities. The hopes of peace and goodwill to men that have from time to time been aroused by the advance of man

from a military to an industrial type of society receive a rude shock, if they are not altogether dissipated, by the appalling spectacle of that constant, chronic and extensive unemployment which seems inseparable from the spread of industrialism. It would seem that the attainment of what we may regard as a higher type of society has brought with it disasters and evils of another and perhaps severer kind than any that can be found in a military type of society. For where in a military society will we find anything to match the utter hopelessness and degradation of deserving yet destitute human beings? Where is there in human history a more pathetic spectacle than that of a strong man hungering and thirsting for the righteous life of labour on behalf of his own fellow citizens, and being sent away empty of hand, empty of heart, empty of hope? Surely it is the cruellest irony of fate which would deny a man even his pitiful desire to share the hard lot of earning his bread by the sweat of his brow. The physical suffering such a condition entails is not so important; for most men can endure starvation, if starvation is rewarded with honour. The real hardship of the unemployed lies not so much in the loss of bread to eat, for he does not merely labour for the meat that perisheth, but in the loss of that dignity of manhood which Burns in his thrilling way called the 'glorious privilege of being independent.' Any measure, therefore, the aim of which is to ameliorate such a dehumanising tendency of an industrial society can but meet with respect and sympathy from all those who are touched by the pathos of human defeat in the face of overwhelming odds.

But the emotional aspect of the situation must not carry us off our feet. Just because the case is so desperate and despairing, we must be the more critical and careful in applying the remedy, and in examining any remedy that professes to be a permanent cure. Those who insist on the right to work maintain that it is an adequate remedy. Let us then examine the nature of this claim.

First, let us ask what is meant by a *right* to work. It may mean on the face of it two things: (1) a demand that others should provide a man with work to do; (2) an obligation on the part of the workman to do the work demanded of him. When a man, e.g., says he has no right to work at such and such a thing, he is using the phrase 'right to work' in the second sense. When he claims work to do he is using the phrase 'right to work' in the first sense. No doubt these two senses have a common principle; but we are primarily concerned here with the right to work in the first sense. It is

a demand that others shall provide a man with work to do. Let us analyse such a demand.

To do so we have to determine at the outset the nature of the conceptions 'work' and 'right.' Work is essentially efficient activity, on the part of an individual, directly with a view to realising ends which constitute a part of the permanent economic well-being of society, and which are required if that well-being is to be fully attained. This distinguishes work from play on the one hand, and mere exercise on the other. In play we have activity, but the ends pursued are not constitutive and permanent parts of the economic well-being of society. The ends pursued pass with the finish of the game, and nothing remains to the individual but the skill acquired to engage in the same activity again. As we say when playing a game, 'it does not matter; don't take the game so seriously, 'it's only a game'—meaning that its ends are not determining factors of our joint human welfare. The ends are arbitrary, and not necessarily constitutive of well-being. In the case of exercise, again, we have activity undertaken directly for the sake of the energies latent in the individual, either to liberate those energies, or to direct their course in a certain prescribed and arbitrary manner. The end of the exercise lies in, and is limited to, the individual agent, and does not pass beyond him and connect him with his fellows. The end in this case, as in that of the game, is contingent and self-imposed, not strictly imposed by the nature of social well-being. In work the end is such that it is necessarily constitutive of human well-being, and hence the performance of it necessarily connects a man with his fellows. His fellows need it, and so need him who realises the end. This need, and the necessary connexion between man and man thereby established, are symbolised and expressed in the wage paid for the performance of the end. We are not paid for playing, so far as it is playing, nor are we paid for taking exercise, as far as it is exercise; we are or should be paid for working. The payment is just the form in which society acknowledges the need it has for a man's work.

What has been said refers to all forms of work, high and low, skilled and unskilled. Into the kinds of work we do not require to enter here; they no doubt complicate the problem of a right to work, as we can see, but we shall not stop to consider them. Work, then, is the active expression of a man's personality as a social unit; it is directly undertaken to carry out ends demanded by human welfare; and the carrying out of such ends is acknowledged in the wage paid.

Work is thus in a real sense a partial symbol of a man's worth to society, and is a way in which he connects his life necessarily with others.

Next, what is a 'right'? A right is in essence a claim or hold which one will has over the activity of another will in virtue of their joint pursuit of a common end. This common end is in the long run social well-being, the final guardian and sustainer of which is the will of the State, or the joint will of the community. Without the will of the State such a claim on the part of one man over another cannot be made good, or recognised; for this State will is supreme in authority and power over individual wills. When a man makes such a claim or hold over another's will, he calls in the aid of the State to support him in his claim, and the State, pursuing as it does or should do the permanent well-being of the community, determines the claim in the light of this common good. Rights therefore have their source as they have their guarantee in the State. Without the State no rights, without rights no State. The justification for all rights in the long run is the attainment of the common good; the sanction and authority for the exercise of rights is ultimately the State. The State being impartial, rights are necessarily universal; all have similar rights in similar circumstances. Since rights are thus claims on the part of one will over another, owing to a joint share in a common end, rights imply the possession of something by a given individual, and a power of entering into a relation with another will in regard to that which he possesses. These two main elements in the idea of a right are the source of the two general types of right, the right of property and the right of contract.

Let us return now to the expression 'right to work.' In view of what has been said, what meaning can we attach to this expression? We saw that the phrase, in the present controversy, connotes a claim or demand on the part of one individual that another person shall give him work to do. Now the peculiarity of a right is that, since it is asserted in the name of the State, it is one which all individuals in similar circumstances may assert. But all men in the State capable of contributing to its well-being are capable of working. Therefore in this view all have a right to work; in fact, this would naturally be the most common and best known right in the system of rights comprising a civilised life. Yet in the whole history of civilised law-constituted society we will search in vain for the complete formulation and definition of such a right. But surely it would be remarkable if that which should

be the most common and ordinary right in society had never been completely formulated up to the present day.

It will be said, however, that this is a new right claimed, and that even if it had never been claimed before its validity need not thereby be affected. Very well, if it is a new right claimed, it is yet one which, being a right, all may claim if the conditions are fulfilled. Everyone who works or can work does fulfil the conditions required to claim the right, and is entitled to claim it. That all men have not claimed it we have seen. Suppose they all do claim it. What then? By hypothesis they would claim it when they had no work to do. From whom would they claim it? Not from one another, for on our assumption all are in need of it. Nor from the State, for all the individuals together compose the State, and since all individuals on this view are making the claim, the State itself must be in the same position. The State itself therefore cannot grant a claim to satisfy a need when the State itself stands in the same need. And it is evident that this is true both in the case where all demand work without specifying the work, and in the case where all demand work different from that which they are doing—a situation which, on this theory, might very well arise.

But it may be said there is no expectation that all individuals will ever simultaneously make such a claim; the point is that some individuals may take up this position, while all the others do not make such a claim, because they already have work. We again ask, then, in what circumstances is this claim to be made by the few? Obviously when they have nothing to do, and when they have failed to make a bargain with the capacities for labour they are prepared to offer. Yet this seems somewhat paradoxical; if they have failed to find a merchant for their wares, they demand that someone shall be made to buy. But who is to be made the purchaser? It cannot be a private individual, for the latter does not want what is offered, otherwise he would naturally take the trouble to get it. When we look at the Bill of 1908, in which the demand is set forth, we find that the demand is to be made from a Local Authority; in other words, a public body appointed by the State, and therefore, in the long run, the State itself acting through a public body, is to be the party from whom work is claimed as a right. Here then we have the proposal before us in its precise form. The claim is to be made (1) by a section of the people in the community who are out of work, (2) from the State and not from private individuals, (3) for work which the State must provide and pay for at a certain

standard rate. That is to say, a certain number of individuals claim as a right that the State shall enter into a contract with them whereby they will receive pay for doing work for the State.

Now a claim even when made from the State must be legally justifiable, for the whole community is concerned in whatever is done for any section of the community : we cannot ask the State to do for some what, if done, will either be unfair to the rest of the community, or will not tend to the public weal. The public good as a whole is the sole justification in the long run for granting and guarding any right whatsoever. The justification of any claim can only be made at the bar of the public good. The State cannot pretend to be the guardian and protector of the rights of all individuals, if it unduly favours or unduly injures some individuals. A right demanded from the State, therefore, does not relieve us from the necessity of proving it valid, any less than if it were demanded from a single individual.

Now we have seen that rights in general are either rights of property or rights of contract. The right to work is not a right of property. By the nature of work we saw that it is doing something for some one else for a certain reward. One person gives something and in return gets something, and to secure the result one binds himself for a certain length of time to use his capacities for a certain purpose, and the other binds himself at the end of that time to give a reward in exchange for the capacities exercised. Property is involved, no doubt : the worker possesses capacities, and the master possesses the money or its equivalent which he is prepared to pay. But the possession of capacities and the possession of money do not constitute the arrangement called 'doing work.' For this purpose the two must enter into an agreement or compact to exchange in a certain way what they each possess and are prepared to offer. In other words, the relationship between man and man called 'doing work' is essentially a relationship of legal contract. In all civilised States the nature of contract requires that each party to the contract shall, so far as the contract is concerned, be free to enter into it, and therefore free to make the conditions of terminating the contract. Freedom of will is of the essence of a contract ; an involuntary contract is a contradiction in terms. But this implies that the man who wants work done shall not be entitled to constrain or compel the man, who is in a position to do the work, to consent to do it if he does not want to undertake it ; and it also and equally implies that the man who wants to do work shall not be in a position to compel another to give work whether he

wants it done or not. Otherwise we should have in either case a forced contract, and that is an unjustifiable and illegal contract. Now the claim to work is precisely such a forced contract. The two parties to the contract do not stand on equal ground in the transaction: they do not separately have something to offer which they are prepared and are anxious to exchange with one another. The one, the workman, has something, viz. his capacities of body and brain; but the other, viz. the State, is not assumed to have anything which it desires or seeks to offer in exchange.

That is the point, and the whole point. For if the State did want something done, the State would actually offer it to those who could do it and would thus get it done for a wage in the usual way; in that case no such problem as we are considering would arise, and no such claim as that of a right to work would be made. The claim is made because the State does *not* spontaneously offer anything special to be done. In other words, it is assumed here that the State is not a willing and open partner to make the contract of labour with the workmen, but that, in spite of this fact, the State is to be compelled or constrained or required to make such a contract. The bargain is a forced, unequal, and therefore an unfair bargain. That it is the State which is to be so compelled and not an individual does not alter the unfairness in the very least. For it is surely obvious that if the State can, as we all assume it can, act unfairly towards some of the members of the community, certain sections of the community may very readily act unfairly towards the State. The State in this sense is a personality that can be injured just as much as the private citizen. And in fact if we are to treat the State as a contracting party at all, we must treat it as *pro tanto* capable of making a right or a wrong bargain, and therefore capable of being injured or benefited by the bargain. If we ask how the State can be injured, the answer is perfectly simple. It can be injured first of all in that such a transaction is bound to fall hard on the rest of the community other than those who demand work from the State; and, secondly, in that such a transaction does not further the end which the State has to secure—the common or general good.

Such a right to work, then, is a claim to establish an illegal and unfair contract with the State, a claim that the State against its own wishes shall make a bargain with certain workmen. This of itself would condemn the whole position taken up. But let us see some results. Since the claim is a one-sided claim, a claim in the interests of one party—the

workmen—it follows that the kind of work to be done and the rate of pay for what is done must be equally determined in a one-sided manner. This is precisely what we find to be the case in the Bill which we have mentioned ; and it is evident in principle that this is bound to be the case. For if the State is to be compelled to enter into a bargain *really* for the sake of the workmen, its own benefit must be either a mere appearance or no benefit at all. Hence we find that the kind of work to be provided is determined (1) by the kind of workmen who want it ; (2) for the length of time they wish it ; (3) without regard to whether it is directly needed by the State or not ; and (4) at a rate of pay which the workmen alone settle.

1. The kind of men who want it are *as a whole* unskilled men, unskilled either in the sense of having no skill in any other work but that out of which they have been thrown, or in the sense of having no skill of any kind, being casual labourers. Hence the only kind of work which will suit such men as a whole is unskilled labour. The kind of labour the State is required to provide is unskilled or purely manual labour. How the State is to find an unlimited, or even limited, amount of unskilled work to be done it is impossible to say, and the promoters of the Bill do not say. The suggestions of the kind of work that might be suitable for such a purpose are proposals to undertake afforestation, land reclamation, or repairs of coast erosion. We will return to this again : the point just now is that the kind of work demanded from and to be given by the State is work that requires no skill because the workmen are as a whole unskilled.

2. The length of time the work is to last is equally settled in the men's interests and in the men's interests alone. For since the State's interests are not primarily considered, the length of time the contract lasts cannot be determined by the State. Hence the length of time of the contract is purely contingent on whether the workmen can or cannot get work in the ordinary way of industry. As soon as they can, off they go, and the State work will be left standing till another wave of unemployment sets in. How this could secure any benefit to the State it is impossible to see : work would be done and left off without regard to whether the task was completed or not : no continuity in work would be sustained ; and even the State would soon fail to take such work seriously.

3. That brings us to the third point : the contract is made regardless of whether the State does or does not want the work. This is necessarily the case, for since the State is constrained to make the bargain for the benefit of the workmen, it has to

find or create the work : if the work were really wanted the State would naturally offer the work, and so would not require to be constrained. But if the work is not really wanted, then it ceases to be really work at all : the work done is not undertaken because thereby some end really necessary to the general well-being would be attained. For we have seen that work just consists in the use of activity to realise some end inherently desirable, or desirable as a component element in social well-being. In work the activity, the toil, the effort is undertaken for the sake of that end, and this alone justifies our strenuous efforts. When the activity or effort is not undertaken for this end, it is not economically necessary, and is not work. In such a case the activity can only be undertaken for the mere benefit of the agent personally, and not for the community. But activity of this kind is, as we have seen, either mere exercise or mere amusement. No one can say that the unemployed workmen use their efforts for amusement. Activity of that kind is, then, merely exercise in the name of work. Hence the so-called work demanded from the State under the conditions we are considering can even at the best be merely a kind of hard exercise which the workmen go through in the days of industrial unemployment. The right to work thus turns out to be in principle no more than a right to take exercise! This is quite evident when we see that it is assumed to be a matter of indifference what the kind of work given by the State is : so long as occupation is provided which will give the workmen something to do, the workman is to be satisfied. But what we may do or leave undone cannot be economically necessary, and so cannot have the seriousness of labour for the common good.

4. All this is confirmed when we take the fourth point : the rate of wages is determined not by what the State can afford or is prepared to give, but by what the workman needs to live on. The amount may be determined anyhow. In the Bill it is determined by the standard rate of wages for work in a given locality. However the rate be fixed, the point is that the rate fixed is to be settled, and must, in such a one-sided bargain, be settled in the interests of the chief partner to the bargain—the workman. But this is the destruction of the very meaning of wage-earning : a wage is the reward given for labour by an employer, and is settled both by what the labourer will take and what the employer is prepared to give. *Both* are essential : yet in this scheme only one party has a voice in fixing the price of the work. This means that the wage has no real economic relation to the work at all : it is

a price arbitrarily fixed regardless of what the work is really worth. It follows that since the work and the wage have nothing to do with one another, the wage is as truly and as really a *gift* as the work is merely a form of exercise. But the wage is necessary ; in fact, the work is done mainly that the workmen may have at least the consciousness of doing something to earn a livelihood. The granting of the wage thus keeps up the appearance that the work is really work, for work is always or should be *paid* for : the provision of the work keeps up the appearance of earning a wage, and so the sense of earning a livelihood. But two appearances do not make a reality, even if they join hands. And the work is as much a mere semblance of work as the wage is a mere semblance of wages. If we ask what is really the most important element to the workman in this whole transaction he will tell us, and tell us truly, that the important thing is that he gets money for his toil in order to buy the means of subsistence. That is his true interest in the whole affair : and rightly, because he is hungry and cold. But this admission throws a lurid light on the so-called claim to work : for it now turns out that the right to work is really not a demand for work but a demand for wages : the claim to work is a claim to money. Shall we push this conclusion further, and say that a demand for money which is not really earned in the only way money should be earned is closely akin to exploitation and the methods of the highwayman ? We may refrain from drawing this conclusion, but we do so in the interests of human kindness and not of logic. Certainly it would be more reasonable on the part of those who put forward this claim to say at once that they must have a certain sum for the necessities of life ; for then we should both admit the demand and try to meet it. Their unreasonableness lies in making such a claim on the charities of their fellow citizens in the name of a specious claim to receive money for unnecessary work. That this request for charity is all that they really mean is evident from the very clauses of the Bill of 1908. For it is there stipulated that in the event of no work being found by the State at the price named, the unemployed are to receive a sufficient allowance from the State to maintain themselves and their families. This is strictly and truly the only real demand which they are in a position to make or which can be admitted by the State.

It is very important to notice in considering these consequences of admitting such a claim, that the four characteristics of the forced contract just analysed are at the best contradictory and mutually inconsistent. It is absurd to ask the

State to institute employment for unskilled workers and yet undertake work of vital national importance : it is absurd to demand employment requiring no special skill and yet ask the standard wage prevalent in a given locality : it is wasteful and foolish to start on a big national undertaking which, if it be serious, must necessarily require a long time for its completion, and yet allow the workmen to move off to other work whenever a change for the better in the general industrial life of the country takes place : it is ridiculous to create work at the expense of the State for the benefit of those out of employment, and yet expect this work to be undertaken and carried through to the advantage and profit of the State.

When we turn to the kind of work which it is proposed to start for the sake of the unemployed workmen, we find the practical objections to the proposal as strong as those already mentioned. The work proposed, as already said, is such as national afforestation or land reclamation. Now, in the first place, how are skilled mechanics, who form part of the unemployed, to perform successfully even such apparently simple kinds of work as these ? Is it conceivable that a man who has been accustomed to handle a machine in a factory can suddenly adapt himself without any knowledge or training to planting trees, clearing waste lands, and improving the condition of the soil ? This kind of labour requires the developement of a new set of adjustments, a new set of muscles, new instincts of what is suitable and unsuitable—in short, requires a certain amount of training under skilled supervisors, otherwise the work is wholly wasted. This needs time and a willing mind on the part of the workman. Are we to train these men as apprentices at the expense of the State and pay them all the while the standard wages of journeymen ? Will the men who have for the better part of their lives been used to skilled mechanical labour suddenly and readily submit themselves to a new apprenticeship, especially when they know that the work at the best is a stop-gap, and that with the first rise in industrial prosperity they will move back to work with which they have been and are more familiar ? Is the State to be made to suffer doubly by the transaction, first, by its being forced to undertake work it does not immediately require, and secondly, by the blunders and mistakes of men unused to such work ? Where is the army of supervisors to come from to meet the sudden demand made on the State for suitable trainers and gaffers ?

In the next place, suppose such work is undertaken, by the nature of the case it is to be dropped as soon as other work can be provided in the general industrial market of the country.

But what then becomes of the schemes undertaken by the State? We cannot clear land for forestry purposes, still less plant a forest, and then leave it to itself. We must retain a proportionately large number of men to plant up the land that is cleared (otherwise it will go back to its former condition), and to look after the forests that are planted. But there is no provision for such labour, and can be none, if the first wave of general industrial prosperity carries off all or most of the workmen. Still more evident is this the case with, say, land reclamation. It is useless to reclaim land unless we are prepared to keep it in good order when it is reclaimed: it is absurdly wasteful to let it return to its former state after it has been secured. Yet this is precisely what will and must happen in this scheme. For we have no hold over the workmen for any definite period of time.

Further, suppose all these difficulties removed, the scheme is no permanent cure at all for unemployment. For the possible undertakings of a national kind which we might start are not unlimited. We will ultimately come to an end of afforestation. We cannot plant forests for ever. And we will come to an end of the land which we are to reclaim, for the land is limited in amount, and not all of it requires to be reclaimed. What then? Shall we have removed unemployment? Not in the very least. The unemployment we seek to cure arises from general industrial causes, and these causes, by hypothesis, have not been touched by the scheme: we have merely started other schemes of work to meet a fluctuating condition of the industrial labour market. We will, in the long run, come to an end of our national schemes for State employment of labour, but will not have removed the cause which produces unemployment. When this condition has been reached the State resources for labour will be exhausted, and we will have to fall back on direct State relief. The so-called State cure for labour is at best a mere temporary palliative and no permanent cure for the trouble.

Lastly, the cost of any such State undertakings is proved in practice, as it is evident it must be in principle, overwhelmingly disproportionate to the return. It has been proved in fact that work undertaken in such circumstances as we are dealing with is most costly and improvident. Let us take an example mentioned by the President of the Local Government Board. At Hollesley Bay work has been undertaken of exactly the same kind that the Bill of 1908 proposes to establish. It is a comparatively small estate, and, on an average, 250 men a day have been employed on it under the Central Unemployed

Body. In three years the undertaking cost in gross amount 100,000*l.* 'Before the estate became a public relief works, a 'steward with eighteen farm hands was able to make a small 'profit or a small loss every year. Since it became a State 'relief works, with 250 men engaged on it, it has been a net loss 'of 21,000*l.* a year.' This is what might be expected if we consider the bare principle involved in all such work. The State is not asked to work for a profit, but to work for the benefit of the unemployed; and if so, it has no right to expect anything but a loss at the end of the year. The only way it could really ensure getting a profit is to turn off those who are incapable or who are reluctant workers, and ensure that the work is really done, and in the way it should be done. But this, by hypothesis, the State is not asked or entitled to do; it has to take on the men, and as many men as possible who can work. In other words, the engagement of the men is an act of State charity exercised under compulsion; and for charity we do not expect a return; in fact, we expect to be out of pocket at the end of the year.

It is easy to see that, if this is the case, the work is unremunerative, and must be carried through to the detriment of the general wealth of the country. The money to pay such workers is to come from the rest of the members of the community, from taxes and rates. This means a depletion of the national resources and a diminution of the general prosperity. It is a permanent economic loss to the State.

The foregoing criticism may well seem fatal to any proposal to establish a right to work as a claim in law. But it is worth while, before concluding this section of the argument against the proposal, to refer to two further results which such a claim, if admitted, necessarily entails.

It is a peculiarity of all legal claims in a civilised community that once accepted they inevitably create others which are seen to be logically associated with or indirectly to arise out of those established; for a claim involves a principle of right, and a principle will readily be found to have applications very different from those in the interests of which it was first introduced. The right-to-work proposal is put forward primarily in the interest of a certain section of workmen, those, namely, whose type of labour is mechanical or manual, whether skilled or unskilled; and the claim put forward is for employment in wage-earning work of a mechanical kind, without further specification of the nature of the work. But if such a claim be conceded it is equally possible for a class of men to come forward and demand from the community work of a specialised

character, involving a specific kind of skill and training, a specific type of brain, and a specific mental predilection. Such a claim would be perfectly justified. Work is work, whether it be specialised or not. One might say, indeed, there is a certain modesty in a right-to-work scheme which merely asks for unskilled labour for men unemployed. Why should skilled mechanics not combine together to insist on the community providing work which is more congenial to their training and habits, and by which, they might very well urge, they are best able to do their utmost for the community? So far as the community is concerned, it has as much, perhaps even more need for the capabilities of its skilled workers than for those of the unskilled. In any case, it can have no special interest in finding unskilled work when it is admitted to have no interest in providing work of any kind whatever. It might be as easy and as profitable, or, what is the same thing here, as difficult and unprofitable, to find skilled work as unskilled. If this be so, why should not the 800 school teachers, recently thrown out of work in the London County Council Schools, demand from the State employment suitable to their capacities, training and predilections? Why provide work for manual labourers and not for mental labourers? There is no peculiar hardship in the former case more than in the latter; in fact, there is more hardship in the case of out-of-work mental toilers. Nor is there any special advantage to the community in providing for mechanical labourers rather than for mental workers, nor have the former any special claims over the latter, except the claim of superior numbers, a claim which is absolutely immaterial to the State, since one section of the community, no matter what its numbers may be, is as necessary to the State as another. Further, since there is no hold, in this right-to-work scheme, on the will of the individual worker (for he can put himself out of employment whenever he chooses to do so), what is to prevent the dissatisfied and discontented amongst all classes of workers throwing up their present employment, and demanding of the State to be employed in work for which they might think they are better fitted, or which they might feel would be more congenial?

From such considerations as these we see that in the very principle of the right-to-work proposal there is necessarily involved the demand that the State must take upon itself to be the universal provider of work of every description for any and all of its citizens who care to put in a claim. But from this a remarkable result follows. For since the State and the State alone can assume such a function, the State will be not

only the universal provider but the absolute controller of all the work and all the workers. We cannot ask the State to be our paymaster-general alone : give it complete power to provide work all round and it will take complete charge over all its citizen workers, directing, placing, and, if necessary, suppressing them as seems best. It will be the supreme employer of labour, and, once attaining that high altitude, there will be no question of any workman making a bargain with the State in his own interest : the State will then be in a position to make a bargain with him in *its* interests. But this, the logical outcome of the right-to-work proposal, is the complete *bouleversement* of the original intention and aim of that proposal. For the claim on the part of workmen to control the action of the State in the interest of unemployed thus turns into a claim on the part of the State to control the action of the workmen in the interest of the State. The right to work from the State becomes when fully developed a right on the part of the State to control all workmen.

A further consequence to which this proposal must logically lead, if it be once admitted, is still more remarkable. If the claim to work from the State be admitted, we are bound to admit that when anyone is really destitute of any of the essential elements of human welfare, he is justified in calling on the State, the guardian of the general welfare of the community, to supply the deficiency. Work is only one important element of human well-being, and does not exhaust all that this contains ; nor does it of necessity have any paramount claim over the other elements constituting human welfare. If work is to be supplied when individuals are in need of it, why not any or all of the other elements when they are felt to be wanting ? There are thousands of individuals in the community whose well-being as members of a human society would be vastly improved by the addition of a greater variety or amount of food and warmer or better clothing, of sources of artistic enjoyment such as the arts alone can supply, of cheap and accessible literature, of scientific knowledge, of better means of locomotion, and other equally important factors which are required to make human life in a society full, satisfying, and elevating. The claim to all these must be admitted, if the right to work is conceded, for the principle involved is precisely the same, namely, that human welfare is secured or heightened by the admission of such a claim on the State for assistance. In short, the right to work as an element of human well-being involves the right to every element of human good that a community can supply. But such a

position is pure paradox, or else pure nonsense : for it means that the State is to be not simply the universal provider of work but the universal provider and dispenser of human happiness. This is surely the *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole claim. For if all the individuals in the community make all these various claims on the State, it must be because they want these elements of human well-being and do not possess them. But since the State is hopelessly impotent apart from all the individuals composing it, the State must itself be without the means of supplying the demands claimed from it ; it is itself as poor as they, and is indeed poor with their poverty. To ask the State, therefore, for every element of human well-being is to claim infinite riches from a source whose only attribute is infinite poverty.

The legal aspect is no doubt the primary aspect of the right-to-work proposal, for the claim put forward is ostensibly a legal claim. A few words therefore may suffice for what is left to say regarding the other two aspects of the problem, the economic and the moral.

The economic aspect, which has been already partially mentioned, has three elements, the work, the workers, and the wages.

Economic work is work required by the spontaneous needs of a community and done at a profit to both workmen and employer. From what has been said, we can see without further discussion that work undertaken under the right-to-work scheme is not required by the community, is not done at a profit, and is therefore not economic work. Work done at a permanent loss to the community is, in the economic sense, as well as in other senses, waste labour. This 'right to work' is, economically speaking, a right to do what nobody wants at a price which nobody would care to pay.

This is serious enough, but perhaps more serious is the effect on the workers. If work has to be created and room has to be made for a number of men out of work, and merely because they are out of work, the economic result is that the labour market is thrown out of gear. Factors are introduced which have nothing to do with determining the normal relations of demand and supply of labour. Setting aside for the moment the case where new work is provided exclusively for those out of employment, take the other cases which must and do occur in practice. In all cases other than that just mentioned, labour is or is to be provided for a number of men at a kind of work already done by workmen who are engaged and employed on the usual terms. One of two things happens. Either numbers

of the unemployed are set to do work and produce an article already being produced for the community, e.g. chopping wood for fuel: the result here is that the market for the produce is over-supplied, the price of the article goes down, and the ordinary efficient workman, economically dependent on that kind of trade, is unable to make his living. The mere number of unemployed doing that kind of work gives them the advantage in competition with the efficient workman, especially as it is a matter of indifference what they get for their work; hence the economically efficient workman is beaten in the struggle for his existence, and in his turn is compelled to become one of the unemployed. In other words, the ranks of the unemployed are swelled by the very process adopted to give employment. This is not an imaginary case: it has actually happened. The other alternative is that a large number of men who are entirely out of work are set to do work already economically performed by one or a few workmen. In this case the economic wages have to be distributed over the increased number of men, with the result of lowering the previous wage of the economic workman, or even depriving him of his employment altogether. This also has actually happened. Thus in London in 1904 road-sweeping machines and their drivers were dismissed in order to make way for a number of unemployed who were given the work to do by hand; in Paddington forty-seven efficient men engaged in looking after the Parks were dismissed, so that a far larger number of men who were out of work might do the job. Thus, economically considered, we see that the right to work is in all such cases the right of one man to deprive another of work.

But even when we take the case where work is provided at the expense of the community in order that exclusively the unemployed may be drafted into this new channel out of the labour market, the result on the workers is most harmful. For such work though unskilled is in a great many cases (and in the Bill of 1908 would be in all cases) higher paid than that of many other kinds of labour. Now the right to work says nothing and claims nothing regarding the will of the individual worker: he can, if he likes, make himself unemployed any time he wants to do so: he has only to give up his job and he becomes unemployed. If then the price of labour under the right-to-work scheme is in any respect higher or the work easier than that found in the case of any other kind of labour, the inevitable result will be that men at present economically efficient and hired in the ordinary way will make themselves unemployed, give up their present job, and apply for work

under the right-to-work scheme. This has actually taken place under the Bill of 1905. Why should a man work for 15s. at ordinary economic rates, if he can get 25s. at right-to-work rates? Nay more, it has actually been found that men will leave economic work paid at 18s. or 19s. a week in order to have work at 5s. or 7s., simply because irregular relief work has peculiar fascinations of its own. It is clear too that any or all such results are bound to react on the normal labour market; and if men leave economically efficient work to take up work neither economic in character nor strenuously efficient, the general level of industry in the country is lessened, the output is diminished, commodities increase in price, and life becomes dearer accordingly for *all* workers.

This brings us to the last economic factor—wages. The wages offered to workmen may be said to come from two sources, the profits of the particular employer, and the general wealth, or general supply of desirable commodities, in a country. Wages cannot be given unless the capitalist gets profits, and there cannot be wages if there is no supply of commodities which form the real pay of the workmen. But if the unemployed are to be kept and paid at the expense of the community as a whole, the money can only be found by taxation and rating. The more unemployed, the higher the taxes put on those who are efficient. But when trade is depressed, the capitalist employs fewer men; he suffers with the general depression; his profits are less and therefore he has less money both to pay wages and to pay taxes. If he is taxed to pay the unemployed, he will have still less profit left from which to pay wages; he will therefore dismiss more men. In other words, what is taken in unnecessary taxes is in general lost in wages, and the number of unemployed is increased. Conversely, what is saved from needless taxes is in general spent in wages, for the capitalist will invest his money, which means employment somewhere, and therefore wages. But not only will taxation mean loss of wages altogether for some, it will tend to lower the wages of those who still remain economically employed. For the very number of unemployed creates a difficulty and a danger for those employed. Competition for labour is thereby increased and this means that those will get the work who can do it for the smaller pay. The taxation for the unemployed therefore tends to lower wages all round. This is specially true in trades requiring little skill, and it is just there that the pressure of the unemployment problem is greatest. Thus it turns out that the right to wages from the State becomes a right of one man to deprive another of his economic wages.

The right to a wage for what nobody really wants becomes a right to lower a man's wage for what is really wanted.

Again, the right to work means economically a right to wages all round, wages for everybody. But there can only be wages all round if the general wealth of the country is increased. Wages ultimately come from the commodities actually produced and which together form the wealth of a country; and wages are ultimately given *in* commodities. It is not simply money but what money will buy that constitutes wages. The first and sole condition to get wages all round is therefore to raise the wealth of the community all round. But the right-to-work scheme puts the matter in exactly the opposite way: it does not first insist on creating the wealth and then looking after the wages, it proposes first to get the wages and let the wealth look after itself. Nay more, by the work it proposes to institute, it produces a result which by hypothesis nobody really wants, and therefore which does not raise but lowers the actual general wealth of the community. It thus lowers the amount of wealth which would give wages to all, and yet demands wages for everybody all the same. It is like a man trying to climb a steeple by a rope too short and then cutting off a bit from the top to tie on to the bottom. Moreover, by withdrawing men from profitable work, and this scheme does so by increasing taxation, it decreases the supply of commodities through which and through which alone wages can in the long run be paid. It takes men from work that is wanted to employ men at work that is not wanted: there will thus be less production of things that are wanted, less to pay the unemployed and so less employment. The fact is, as some one has said, the wealth of one man is the wages of another, and the real employers of the workers are the workers themselves. To prevent workers doing profitable work is thus to take away the very means of earning wages: it kills the bird that lays the golden egg. The right to work is thus a right to destroy the wealth of the community as a whole for the benefit of a few.

The main points in connexion with the moral aspect of the problem may be stated in a sentence. Such a scheme as that proposed in the Bill of 1908 must destroy the mutual suitability of work and worker, so essential to the healthy interest and efficiency of the workmen on the one hand, and profitable labour on the other. To put a skilled man to do unskilled work of any kind is obviously bad for the man, and is certainly bad for the work. Left to himself he will treat the work with careless indifference. It is as bad to give a man less work or a lower kind of work than he is fitted for as it is to give a

man more or better work than he can profitably undertake. Good work, work that is good for a man and good in value, is only possible when there is an approximate balance between the capacities of the toiler and the character and quality of the work to be done. No doubt a great deal of work is done without anything like a successful balance between the two. But the point to observe is that the right-to-work principle ignores altogether the importance of this moral condition of all healthy work. For such a condition can only be attained if there is free play between the individual worker and the employer of labour.

Moreover, it is demoralising to worker and employer alike if the wage paid has not a real and direct economic relation to the work done. The worker's serious interest in his work, which largely comes from the sense that his work has a real and not a fictitious economic value, is completely undermined if he knows that, whatever be the amount or quality of the work done, the same pay will be forthcoming. The employer, too, loses all vital interest in the work for the same reason; he looks upon it with indifference, and regards the workers, not with respect, but with pity or contempt. Work for the State cannot have the dignity of labour for the commonweal, when the State is grudgingly compelled to provide such work to the loss of the community.

Finally, the herding of men together into compounds to do State-prescribed work, in places remote from the families of the workers, and under conditions where the minimum of interest is taken in the workmen, can only be considered dehumanising in the extreme. The workman's sense of responsibility to the community for his work, which is encouraged and sustained by linking his work with the needs of his own family circle, is corrupted and destroyed. Even if such an experience lasted but a short time, it could only leave the worker morally worse than it found him.

One word in conclusion. We need not suppose that this scheme is really new or has not been tried. It was proposed as early as 1601 in an Act of Elizabeth, and led ultimately to the disastrous results described in the Report of the Poor Law Commission of 1832. It was tried in France in 1848, and produced nothing but social and political and economic confusion.

ART. IX.—MARY STUART,

1. *Marie Stuart*. By LADY BLENNERHASSETT. Paris : Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1909.
2. *Histoire du Règne de Marie Stuart*. By MARTIN PHILIPPSON. Paris : Emile Bouillon. 3 vols. 1891.
3. *Maria Stuart im Drama der Weltliteratur*. Leipzig : Max Hesse's Verlag. 1907.
4. *Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots, 1561-7*. By T. K. POLLEN, S.J. Scottish Historical Society. 1901.
5. *The Casket Letters and Mary Queen of Scots*. By T. F. HENDERSON. London : A. and C. Black. 1890.
6. *The Mystery of Mary Stuart*. By ANDREW LANG. London : Longmans and Co. 1902.
7. *Authentic Portraits of Mary Queen of Scots*. By LIONEL CUST. London : John Murray. 1903.

IN the magnificent, impartial sanctuary of Westminster Abbey men of differing religions have been laid side by side : enemies have been reconciled : murderer and victim have been entombed. Amongst these pacts of death none strikes the imagination with greater force than that of two women. Their cenotaphs are placed in parallel positions of honour in recesses on either side of Henry VII's Chapel, equi-distant from the holy shrine of Edward, King and Confessor. The catafalques are equal in magnificence, the alabaster effigies that lie below the marble canopies are both decked as queens : both pairs of feet rest on the same significant heraldic lion. The Abbey honours the unhappy, fugitive, ill-fated Queen whose six years of power were expiated by eighteen years of durance and a violent death, no less than it honours the most splendid and successful Queen of modern history, whose assured reign was the golden age of the country over which she ruled. Neither woman ever looked on the other's face, yet neither was long out of the other's thoughts. One died, it is true, as disconsolately as the other, deserted by friends and lovers ; and has not time equalised their fates ? for round one head shines the martyr's aureole, while on the other rests the crown of material success.

Someone once said that the only biography which English people read willingly is the Life of Mary Queen of Scots, and that if variations on her career were brought out every month

or two they would find countless readers and buyers. Absurd as this assertion sounds, there is a measure of truth in it, for interest in her life never dies, never even fades. From the day of Darnley's murder a continuous series of poems, plays and operas have been composed about this Queen. Vondel, Alfieri, Schiller, Swinburne and a host of less known writers have been roused to celebrate her tragic story. Thirteen pages of the British Museum Catalogue attest to the interest she has evoked in the minds of men and women of all nations. Mr. Cust's beautiful book enables us to compare twenty-seven authentic representations of Mary with six supposititious ones, and from studying it we can form a clear idea of the appearance of this woman of undefinable charm. But in spite of all these efforts, no one has ever portrayed the magic of Mary, no one will ever know why her biographers develop into partisans, why hardly anyone in writing about her has been able to resist weighting the balances in one direction or the other.

If we were to sit down and ask ourselves what virtues Mary possessed we should not find the list long, but, as M. Philippson says, '*elle n'a point été la femme de mœurs légères que ses adversaires se plaisent à nous dépeindre depuis plus de trois siècles.*' She was courageous, generous, grateful to all who showed her kindness, and a lover of high and dangerous things. Her aptitudes were in a measure heroic, although in practice she was cruel, faithless, untruthful, incapable of deep feeling or idealised love and subject to gusts of physical passion. What is it that makes us forgive her so much? Is it her youth? Is it her dreadful expiation of those seven years in Scotland, years crowded with incident, streaked with tragedy, stained by crime, darkened by intrigue?

The last historian to attempt an appreciation of this chequered life is Lady Blennerhassett, a woman well qualified by the habit of patient investigation and the methodical practices engendered by a life of serious work, as well as by her acute perceptions and judgement, to hold the balance fair. Emphatically this biographer is not a partisan, though she has a theory. It seems a reasonable one. She suggests that Mary's acts should not be judged by any of our personal standards of conduct, but should be referred to her idea of herself, to her belief that she was something more than a mere woman since she represented the majesty and sanctity of the kingly prerogative. It is probably true that Mary had no private standard of behaviour and that she was fundamentally convinced that all personal inclinations and aversions should be sacrificed to political combinations, to the exigencies of government. That

these combinations and exigencies occasionally necessitated the removal of certain persons from the scenes of daily life was to her no matter for idle regrets, for her view was detached, as that of any general who regards 'casualties in action' as the means of accomplishing his end. With regard to herself also she stood completely aloof from sentimentalism, and Lady Blennerhassett, in writing of her matrimonial negotiations, says 'On la voit toujours prête à immoler sa personne à n'importe quelle combinaison politique.'

A virtue attaching to this latest biography is the admirable sense of proportion displayed in it. Everyone who has read many of the 'Lives' of Mary Queen of Scots realises what undue importance is given in them to the facts of the Riccio and Darnley murders and to the mystery of the Casket Letters as against the actual bearing upon affairs of the conspiracies they symbolised. Lady Blennerhassett, though giving a detailed account of the crimes and the incriminatory letters, does not lose sight of, or allow the reader to lose sight of, the political combinations of which they were but indications.

Mary's life falls into four periods—the first consisting of five years' childhood in Scotland, the second of fourteen years in France, the third of seven years in Scotland, the fourth of eighteen years in England. The first of these periods is of scant importance, except from the point of view of foreign politics. From the moment of James V's death, six days after Mary's birth, the kings of Europe began to intrigue as to her eventual marital alliance. When dying, Henry VIII, far-seeing statesman as he was, impressed on Somerset, the Protector of the kingdom, that a marriage between his son Edward and Mary Stuart must be put through and, if necessary, by force. In execution of this project Somerset crossed the Tweed in 1547, and fought the Scots at Pinkie. Defeated in battle, the Northerners immediately identified the idea of national independence with a French alliance, and offered their baby Queen to France in exchange for help. Their offer was accepted, and the engagement of Mary to the Dauphin Francis confounded English policy.

With a sad heart Mary of Lorraine despatched her child to France. Five other Maries and several half-brothers, including Lord James Stuart, embarked with her, and in the first days of August 1548, at the very time when John Knox, chained to the oar of a French galley, was labouring on the North Sea, the little convoy tacked along the west coast of Ireland to keep clear of English ships. At Roscoff, near Brest, a chapel stands to commemorate that calm summer voyage and

happy landing. Thus were inaugurated the fourteen years of life in France, those years which both from the castles of Scotland and the prisons of England were looked back upon as Paradise.

The King of France called Mary the most accomplished child he had ever seen, and Diane de Poitiers treated her kindly, making sure that she was properly fed and properly clothed. Her education was well conducted, and at thirteen we find her declaiming a Latin oration before the court on the advantages of arts and letters to women, writing themes on Aesop, Cato and Cicero, as well as letters on hunting the fallow deer, and remedies for the toothache. Serious studies were considered good for children, but the main vocation of the royal circle was the practice of what they called '*joyusitie*,' the elaborate profession of a leisured class in that day as in all days—a brilliant exquisite cloak disguising immorality, want of purpose and want of heart. '*Joyusitie*' was just the quality that Mary was in the future to try to impress on dour Scotland, and the quality she was to miss most amongst her northern subjects.

Mary Stuart's marriage to her royal *fiancé* was accomplished ten years after her landing, and as a mark of national approval the Scots Parliament, inspired by Mary of Lorraine, voted the crown matrimonial to the French prince. Lord James Stuart, when nominated by his Regent to convey the sword, sceptre and crown of Scotland to the husband of his Queen, made many pretexts of delay and ended by never executing the commission. The death of Mary Tudor, which occurred in the same year as the wedding of Mary Stuart, was the signal for the King of France to give a foolish order, the unforeseen effects of which were destined to overcast the life of his gay little daughter-in-law. He ordered that the Royal arms of England should be quartered with those of France. Before signing the marriage contract with the Dauphin, Mary Stuart had secretly bequeathed (in the event of her dying without issue) Scotland and her claim on the English throne to France. Emboldened by possession of this secret treaty, Henry II, ignoring the claims of Elizabeth, ordered that Francis and Mary should be proclaimed sovereigns of Scotland, England and Ireland. The effect of this proclamation was that the only hope of national independence in Scotland became at once centred in an alliance with England.

Four years before her marriage Mary Stuart appointed her mother, Mary of Lorraine, as Regent of Scotland. In trying to govern Scotland with Frenchmen the Regent had got into great difficulties. Her councillors were located at Paris and

Fontainebleau, and Scots people resented their country being regarded as an outpost of France, a colony held by military occupation. Great dissatisfaction and suspicion of the Government were felt, and the Lords of the Congregation, headed by Lord James Stuart, called in English help to take the power out of the Regent's hands. Elizabeth, the English Queen, was in a dilemma, since she was unwilling on principle to support insurgents against an established Government, and yet fully aware of the intention of France to strike at England through Scotland. In February 1560 she decided to ally herself with the leaders of the Protestant party in defence of national liberties, and in March she sent Lord Grey across the border with an army to attack Mary of Lorraine's troops entrenched at Leith. During the siege of this town the Regent, who had been ill for some time, died, and, owing to misfortunes by sea which affected the supplies and reinforcements of the French army in Scotland, the French were forced to make peace with the Lords in two months. Desiring the union of their country with England, the Lords invited Elizabeth to marry Arran and so reign over Great Britain. This offer was declined, but the double 'Pact of Edinburgh' was drawn up, a pact which on the one hand obliged Mary to withdraw French troops from Scotland and to authorise a Council of Government there, and on the other hand obliged her to abandon all claim to the English throne. This Pact, though agreed to by the Scots and French negotiators, was never ratified by their Queen. Little, however, in the future was the Calvinist confederacy to trouble itself with the shadow of Royal power left in Scotland. It had determined that the affairs of the realm were to be administered by twelve gentlemen named by the Queen and five by the Estates, and in order to give a permanently Protestant character to Parliament it was arranged that several hundreds of proprietors and freeholders, especially selected from Protestant Fife, should be introduced into the assembly of spiritual and temporal lords.* These proprietors were many of them in actual possession of ecclesiastical property and were awaiting the legalisation of their authority. Many members of Parliament therefore depended for their very existence on the maintenance of Protestantism, and this explains much of the savage feeling manifested in this and succeeding years.

Mary continued to display the arms of England, but the display was short-lived, for her boy husband died in the very

* Philippon, vol. i. p. 191.

year in which the Pact was made, leaving behind him the most forlorn little widow of eighteen, writing poetry and regretting the past.

During her 'white mourning' Mary Stuart was approached on behalf of many suitors, and since she was no longer to be feared as Queen of France, overtures were received from Scots subjects. Leslie came on behalf of the Catholic minority, and Lord James Stuart was despatched by the Calvinist confederacy 'to grope her mind.' Emphatically did the latter impress on Mary that it was impossible to reimpose Catholicism on Scotland, but that, since Elizabeth had refused the hand of their nominee Arran, the Calvinists were anxious to have his sister as their Queen.

Mary considered her situation. There was no place for her in France, and from Scotland it was as easy to conduct matrimonial negotiations as from any other part of Europe. Moreover, her kingdom called her to the responsibilities of queenship. Deciding to go to Scotland, she placed herself unreservedly in the hands of her brother and begged a safe-conduct of Elizabeth for her voyage. This the English Queen refused to grant until the Pact of Edinburgh was ratified. With spirit Mary told Elizabeth's ambassador :

'Malgré l'opposition de mon frère je suis venue en France. Malgré l'opposition d'Elizabeth, je retournerai en Ecosse. Elle a fait alliance avec mes sujets révoltés ; mais il est aussi des sujets rebelles en Angleterre qui volontiers entendront mon appel. Je suis vaine comme elle et je ne manque d'amis. Et mon âme est peut-être aussi grande que la sienne.' *

A crowd of friends and relations escorted Mary to the sea-coast and there many unhappy farewells were said, but 'joyusitie' prevailed, and she embarked without waiting for the safe-conduct of Elizabeth, which came on the very day she sailed. Three uncles went with her, d'Aumale, d'Elbœuf, and the Grand Prior as well as chronicler Brantôme, poet Chastelard, and secretary Castelnau. As they left the shore a boat sank in front of their eyes. 'My God, what an augury is this for a 'journey!' said Mary in horror.

There was something terrible about quitting a country then, something momentous which we in these days of safe and easy travel can never know. Mary, as she stood leaning over the poop of the vessel, watching the clouding coast, murmured, among her slow-falling tears, farewells to that dear country,

* P. 60. Lady Blennerhassett.

France. She stood there sobbing for five hours ; they persuaded her to leave the stern, and she, with a little laugh, said she had done the opposite of Dido, who had gazed at the sea when Æneas left. It was summer time and she caused her bed to be made up on the bridge, with an order that she was to be waked if the coast of France was still visible in the early dawn. They made but short way in the night, and she was able to look once more on the dim coast and exclaim ' Adieu, France, 'je pense ne vous revoir jamais plus.'

The North Sea was overhung with dense fog and Brantôme thought they must be wrecked. ' What does it matter,' said the Queen, ' if we do sink ? Could we wish for anything else ' than death ? ' Being very miserable herself, she took thought for the most wretched people on board, the oarsmen, whom people were accustomed to regard as part of the machinery of the vessel. She ordered that they should be treated kindly and not beaten.

The landing at Leith in the early morning of August 19, 1561, was a disillusion. Knox says : ' The very face ' of heaven, the time of her arrival, did manifestly speak what ' comfort was brought into this country with her, to wit, ' sorrow, dolour, darkness, and all impiety.' A few days later she was to hear from the lips of this man, her serious enemy, the strange and revolutionary doctrine that the obedience of subjects extends no further than the law of God allows. No one seemed to be glad she had come to Scotland, no one had taken thought for her ; but though she felt as though transported from Paradise to Hell, she knew the only remedy to use was patience. Her horses having been captured by the English, a miserable escort of badly caparisoned steeds was commissioned. She rode on a poor hack to Holyrood, where a crowd received her, singing psalms to violins and rebecks out of tune. Brantôme complained of the noise outside the palace windows that evening, but the discord made Mary smile and recover courage and ' joyusitie ' enough to request a repetition of the ' melody ' for the following day. And so she came into her kingdom—to a land where she was to find no loyal servant and no steadfast friend.

Mary had reserved to herself the right of practising her own religion and had guaranteed not to interfere with the religious settlement arrived at by the Lords of the Congregation prior to her arrival and confirmed by the Parliament of 1560. Calvinism was the officially recognised religion : all Catholic offices were forbidden. Soon after she arrived she ratified existing arrangements for the safeguarding of Calvinism and

the persecution of Catholicism. Mary's conception of her duties as a queen never interfered with her execution of her private religious obligations. They were two separate fields of activity, having no connection with each other. While herself venerating the Blessed Sacrament and accepting fervently the Catholic articles of belief, she was able, without prejudice, to allow the impeachment in her presence of the Catholic Bishop of Dunkeld for making preparations to administer Communion at Easter (1562), and to authorise the incarceration of forty-eight priests for saying Mass secretly. This equivocal lack of fervour earned for her the hatred of the Vatican, just as surely as her private profession of religion earned for her the hatred of her Calvinist subjects. It was only after solidifying her position by marriage with a Roman Catholic that she could venture to negotiate with the Catholic Church and allow her private religious inclinations to become public policy.

Her journey to Inverness to pacify the insurgent Catholics, and the execution of Huntly's son, were all part of an elaborate scheme to win the confidence of her Calvinist subjects, for Mary had no notion in these early days of imperilling her throne by any untimely demonstration in favour of Catholicism.

The more we study Mary's personality, the more strongly we are convinced that she had no recognisable moral code; that questions of right and wrong, consistency, honour, and conviction were nothing to her; that political expediency governed her conduct; that responsibility sat lightly upon her, and that she only felt bound to act up to the old autocratic idea of queenship imparted to her during her education in France. She wanted power, and power was the one thing denied to her during those seven years in Scotland. She was never more than a figurehead, a puppet in the hands of that Calvinist confederacy. Power was no more permanently and essentially centred in her than it was in Darnley or in Bothwell; puppets all were they, to be supported or not by Scots politicians as policy might dictate.

Henceforward the ever-changing background of councillors group and regroup themselves as if in some dark devil-dance about this girl of twenty and her two husbands. Amongst the principals—Moray, Maitland, Morton, Bothwell—one, and one only, was true to her. The seconds—Balfour, Huntly, Argyll, and the rest—are hardly worth troubling about. But moral disgust should not blind us to the issue at stake in their intrigues, which was the maintenance of Protestantism. To some of the politicians who worked so industriously against

their Queen, Mary represented a disastrous policy, the policy of separation from England which jeopardised Calvinism and secured the continual enmity of a powerful neighbour by the continual assumption of heirship to the English throne.

Lord James Stuart (who since the expedition to Inverness had been created Earl of Moray) and Maitland of Lethington did their best to win Mary to these views in the beginning, and Elizabeth, with considerable civility, sent to congratulate her 'sister' on mounting the throne of Scotland. A romantic paper friendship followed. Mary had not ratified the Pact of Edinburgh and Elizabeth refused to acknowledge in the Queen of Scots the next heir to the throne of England; nevertheless, the English Queen protested that she would never forget her own heart than that of Mary, 'this heart I cherish.' Mary kissed her 'sister's' picture, kept her letters in her bodice, would wear no jewel but the diamond of her giving, and assured the English ambassador that in order to end their quarrel she would wish to be a man or else to be able to have the English sovereign for a husband. Many plans were made for the Queens to meet, but they all miscarried, and Elizabeth decided at midsummer 1562 that no meeting should take place. All through the following winter the Queen of Scots worked at the business of government and read Latin prose with Buchanan, but when the new year came her thoughts were diverted to lighter things.

Chastelard, who had been back to France bearing a silver vessel to Ronsard from Mary inscribed 'A Ronsard l'Apollo français,' returned to Holyrood with verses from Ronsard to Mary. He also addressed to her poems of his own making. Mary enjoyed this form of adulation and laid aside her Livy for models of French verse. The poor Huguenot poet lost his head as well as his heart, and, having been twice found concealed in Mary's bed-chamber, was condemned to die for his temerity. This execution was but the prelude to, the foreshadowing, as it were, of the terribly intimate tragedies yet to come, and it set people discussing more violently than ever the question of the Queen of Scots' marriage. Was it to be the 'crétin' Don Carlos or the representative of some other royal house? Elizabeth, it was well known, did not favour a Spanish or an Austrian alliance, because it would displace the balance of power in Europe. An English nobleman devoted to English interests such as Lord Robert Dudley would have been her choice. Mary, who thought a good deal about her own future, laughed and cried hysterically when possible marriages were discussed, asserting that she would marry where she pleased, and again that a widow's lot was most enviable.

At Wemyss Castle, in February 1565, Mary met her young kinsman, Darnley, new come from England, where he had been in almost daily attendance on Elizabeth. She promptly engaged herself to marry him. Randolph talks of her as a woman bewitched and so altered by passion that her wits were affected. Elizabeth declared the engagement 'directly prejudicial to the sincere amity existing between the Queens and consequently perilous to the peace of both realms,' and despatched Throckmorton to Scotland to break it off. The English envoy found a sympathiser in Moray, who viewed the projected alliance with no favour. For the three and a-half years that his sister had been in Scotland, he had ruled her, and on the whole things had gone quietly and well. We know that from the time of the conclusion of the engagement things went anything but quietly and well. The General Assembly of the Church was frantic at the idea of a Catholic consort, and indeed no one viewed it with favour except Mary and the Lennoxes. Looked at politically, the alliance was a good move, however, for it outwitted Elizabeth, as it meant the union of the only two possible heirs to the English throne, and union is strength.

The projected marriage caused the politicians to regroup themselves. Douglas, Morton and Ruthven declared themselves for Darnley; Moray, Chatelherault and Argyll (secretly assured of the backing of the English court) set themselves against him. Mary was faced with rebellion, and a fortnight before her wedding issued an admonition to her faithful lords and gentlemen to join her in arms with fifteen days' provisions.* On the eighth day seven thousand men had obeyed her summons, and others were pouring in. On July 28, 1565, 'en vêtements de deuil mais le cœur en joie,' Mary was married. After the wedding she thought and dreamt only of battle. In August she was at the head of her troops wearing a light cuirass and with a short sword at her saddle. The people were with her, and vainly did Moray try to rouse an anti-Catholic rebellion by calling on the men of Edinburgh to rise and support him in defence of the Evangel. Some of his men deserted, and in the end Mary triumphed without bloodshed. Elizabeth never backed a failure, and Moray's venture was a failure, so when he arrived at her court to report progress she expressed entire ignorance of his erstwhile plans. The possibility of a Catholic combination against her was beginning to agitate Elizabeth's mind, and she deemed it well not to

* Philippson, vol. ii. p. 392.

precipitate its formation by unfriendly action towards her sister Queen.

Philip II highly approved the Darnley marriage and was in process of forming a Catholic league in Europe, in which, as secret agents informed Elizabeth, Scotland was to be enrolled. This league was in some degree the political result of the deliberations of the Council of Trent. Catholicism, under that redoubtable Inquisitor Pius V, was in the ascendant, and so strong seemed the protection and support it might afford that Mary and Darnley, both Catholics by birth, adopted a Catholic policy. They were urged by the Vatican to do away with all leaders of heretics, and Pius V, in his eagerness, was reported to say that he would send his last chalice to help Mary in such an enterprise. In the web of spoken and written negotiations involved by the adoption of the new policy the acute brain of the Queen's private secretary proved invaluable. His name was Riccio, and he had been promoted from chamber varlet to the place of Raulet, the French corresponding secretary, dismissed for indiscretion. Maitland of Lethington, the official foreign secretary, was in practice superseded, his well-known English sympathies making him untrustworthy in subtler Catholic negotiations. Darnley, too, was useless in this matter; he was a careless boy, willing to undertake the state but not the responsibility of kingship. After a while Mary 'removed and secluded' her husband from the Council. To prevent his knowing what letters were written, she had his name printed on an iron stamp, and 'used the same in all 'things.' Darnley was deeply offended at being considered inefficient in counsel by his wife, and proceeded to revenge himself for this slight with all the bitterness of a small mind. Maitland abetted the youth, and, writing to Cecil in February 1566, used the cryptic words 'The axe must be laid to the 'root': words which are supposed to denote approval of the Darnley conspiracy.

Riccio was the son of a musician and sang bass in the Queen's chapel quartette. Though evidence, common sense and nature are against the theory that he was Mary's lover, Darnley was not ashamed some months before the birth of his son to let it be said that Riccio was his wife's paramour. This poor-spirited boy, who had been proclaimed and styled king by his wife on the eve of their marriage, had never been granted in fact 'the crown matrimonial.' This crown connoted equal rights and undisputed succession, and it was a source of great mortification to Darnley that it was still denied to him.

Meanwhile the exiled Moray and his men were anxiously looking

out for a way of return to Scotland. Mary was in no conciliatory mood, and said she would only admit their return if they persuaded Elizabeth to acknowledge her as heir to the throne of England. Seeing that Darnley was vain, ambitious and weak, these refugees approached him with an offer of procuring him the crown matrimonial if he would protect them in their return and swear to maintain Protestantism in Scotland. He accepted their conditions, and presently, either in collusion with these exiles or in execution of the spirit of their enterprise, he engaged himself together with Ruthven and Morton, to kill the controller of the Catholic policy—Riccio—as ‘an enemy of the ‘state.’ Bothwell, Huntly and Athol were not included in the conspiracy. Moray, who had previously tried to buy Riccio with a big diamond and a humble letter, did not appear till the day after the execution of the plot.

In discussing this tragedy we must bear in mind that Riccio might quite well have been killed anywhere and at any time. The two motives for murdering him in the presence of the Queen were equally vile: the first that the death might be regarded and justified as a ‘crime passionnel’: the second that it might endanger the Queen’s life.

The story of the evening has been told so often that it is superfluous to tell it again. It is only significant in so far as it bears on the religious and political situation in Scotland. The object of the conspiracy was, as we have seen, the maintenance of Protestantism, the means were the endangering of the Queen’s life or reputation; and either way it meant the destruction of her authority in the country. Darnley was but the tool of the lords just as Bothwell in a far lesser degree, in so far as he was a stronger man, was their tool in the Kirk-o’-Field conspiracy.*

Although Riccio’s death was a great shock to Mary, and the dagger of Darnley told its own story, the Queen kept her head, and from no word she uttered even in this extremity could it be gathered that she had any love for Riccio. Bent on requitals, she informed Darnley that if she died in giving birth to her child, friends would avenge her, naming Philip II, the Pope, the King of France and various Italian princes as possible champions. It is worth noting that at the same time that Riccio was being killed, the monk John Black, an ardent propagator of Catholicism in Scotland, was murdered in his bed by accomplices of Ruthven and Morton.†

* Philippon, vol. iii. p. 330.

† Ibid. vol. iii. p. 153.

On the day after the murder Darnley dissolved Parliament in his own name. Before the Privy Council, a few weeks later, he declared himself innocent of all conspiracy and, with the inconsequence which made it impossible for Mary to admit him to her counsels, betrayed his accomplices.

Mary was too friendless and too ill to quarrel with Darnley just then. Nearly everyone seemed against her. Morton and Maitland were in the plot; Moray her brother was not ostensibly a plotter, but had he not arrived the day after the murder and requested that pardon should be extended to all concerned in the assassination? Mary's political instinct at this juncture came to her rescue, and with considerable acumen she took stock of the new situation. Bothwell, Huntly and Athol were certainly friends, but she saw that in order to maintain any position herself Darnley must be detached from the Protestant party; he must be made to feel jealousy of Moray's possessions and of his possible power in the country. Suppressing any natural disgust or contempt she may now have felt for her husband, she maintained a kindly, almost tender, attitude towards him, learnt all there was to know about the Protestant conspiracy, and then persuaded him to fly with her to Dunbar. This flight took place three months before the birth of her baby. As they left Holyrood secretly at night they are said to have passed through the crypt where Riccio's body lay, and Mary is credited with a Cassandra-like utterance—to have augured that unless things went badly for her, a fatter man than Riccio would lie beside him before the year was out. Mary was able to return in six days to Edinburgh on a wave of popular feeling. Her position in the country was for the time being safe, for she had succeeded in making Darnley jealous and distrustful of his fellow conspirators and had decided once more to adopt a Protestant policy and support the Calvinist confederacy with her authority.

As the time of her confinement approached she was certain she was about to die, and in the light of the end many things are forgiven. Darnley's treachery was for the time forgotten, and in her will she left him many sentimental tokens. The baby boy was born at Edinburgh Castle on the 19th of June 1566. Mary recovered well and quickly, and with health came new life and an irresistible desire to avoid her husband. Where was she to find a true supporter or a faithful friend? Nothing more forlorn than her condition of mind can be imagined. The moment was ripe for a lover, a rescuer, a hero, and he appeared in the person of James Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell. Her own '*état d'âme*,' as Lady Blennerhassett points out, was the hot-bed

for further tragedy. After recovery she went to Alloa Castle, a boat excursion arranged suddenly and secretly in order to avoid the escort of Darnley. Bothwell in his capacity of Lord High Admiral provided a ship for her transport, but it was Moray himself and not Bothwell who travelled with her.

Darnley went to Alloa for a few days, but soon left for Stirling in an ill-temper at finding himself easily dispensed with by his wife. At the end of September Mary went to Edinburgh to work at finance and the Budget. The summer at Alloa and the early autumn at Edinburgh had brought new political schemes into the minds of all parties. To Darnley it brought the idea of intriguing against the Queen through the Catholic powers; to the Lords (who had discovered that Darnley was too untrustworthy even to be used as a tool) it brought the decision to support Mary and destroy Darnley. To Mary it brought the conviction that Bothwell was the only man strong and single-hearted enough to maintain her ascendancy. During the first week of October the new policy of the Lords crystallised; they declared they would obey no order of the King but only of the Queen. Moray and Morton signed a document to this effect.

On the 9th of October Mary went to Jedburgh to hold an assize. While there news came to her that Bothwell lay dangerously wounded at his castle, the Hermitage. On the 15th of October, when the Session of Justice was over, an incident occurred which has given rise to much speculation and which very probably had some connexion with the declaration of the Lords. Mary rode the twenty odd miles across country, accompanied by Moray, to see Bothwell. Her interview lasted two hours. Hosack is pleased to call this ride * 'a simple act of courtesy,' whereas Buchanan saw in it an act of passionate desire. Probably the truth lies in neither diminution nor exaggeration. Vast quantities of papers, as we know, went to Bothwell the next day from the Queen's councillors and administrators, and it seems credible that in those days of untrustworthy messengers and betrayals something urgent may have made a personal interview important. A ride with a brother, an interview lasting two hours, would hardly be a means of satisfying a passion such as Buchanan divined. The ride, extremely exhausting as it was, was accomplished in thirty-six hours. Mary was ill after it, so ill that she thought herself about to die and commended her son and her Catholic subjects to Moray's care. On the 25th of October, when her

* Vol. i. p. 155.

life was despaired of, Bothwell arrived in a horse litter at Jedburgh to receive her last instructions. But Mary did not die, and soon was back at work again, lodging for the sake of the country air at Craigmillar, a castle three miles to the south of Edinburgh. Her detestation of and irritability with Darnley grew. It had come to her knowledge that he was intriguing against her, and that he had sent letters to France, Spain and the Vatican complaining of her tepidity and indifference towards Catholicism. To the French Ambassador, Mary continually said 'I could wish to be dead,' and that if she could not rid herself of Darnley she would commit suicide. Darnley had a particular dread of Morton (whom he had betrayed over the Riccio murder), and obstinately refused to have him back to Court as had been allowed in the case of some of the other conspirators. The Lords made his refusal to pardon Morton the excuse for an open quarrel with him, and Darnley left the castle. In consequence of this a conference took place, known afterwards as the 'Pact of Craigmillar.' It seems to have arisen informally from conversations held between Maitland, Moray, and Argyll.

These three men were anxious to reinstate Morton and his companions in exile, and Maitland thought the best way to accomplish this would be by getting Darnley and Mary divorced. Argyll said he did not see how this could be done. Maitland said 'We shall find the means to make her rid of him.' These three men then took Huntly and Bothwell into their confidence. Then all went to the Queen. Maitland as spokesman said that if she would consent to pardon Morton means might be found to obtain a divorce between her and her husband. Mary entertained the idea so long as it did not affect the succession of her son. Then it was discussed what rank Darnley was to hold, and the Queen asked whether it would not be better for her to retire for a while to France; this suggestion was strenuously opposed by Maitland.

'Do not imagine, Madam, that we, the principal nobility of the realm, shall not find the means of ridding your Majesty of him without prejudice to your son; and albeit my Lord of Moray *here present* be little less scrupulous for a Protestant than your grace is for a Papist, be assured that he will look through his fingers and behold our doings saying nothing to the same.'

The Queen in reply said :

'I will that ye do nothing through which any spot may be laid on my honour or conscience; and therefore I pray you, rather let

the matter be in the state that it is, abiding till God of His goodness put remedy thereto.' *

She was against divorce, because as a Catholic she could only obtain an annulment on the ground of consanguinity and this would affect the legitimacy of her son. The upshot of the deliberations was that the conspirators agreed to re-establish Morton, Ruthven and the rest who had fled after Riccio's death, and arrest and impeach Darnley for high treason. In December 1566 a bond was drawn up by the corrupt and treacherous Balfour. Balfour, Maitland, Huntly and Argyll signed, binding themselves to remove Darnley by some expedient or other, but Moray did not sign. Morton, Ruthven and Lindsay from Newcastle had sworn as price of pardon to become party to the bond of Craigmillar. Morton on his return refused, however, to take action until he had the Queen's approval of the conspiracy in writing. † Meanwhile outwardly things were going on as usual, and preparations went forward for the baptism of James VI at Stirling. Darnley was not present at the festivities, although he was in the town. The bond-men once more sued their Queen for Morton's pardon, backed this time by the Earl of Bedford and his Royal mistress. What could Mary do but yield, and how could Darnley be anything but terrified at the reinstatement of his worst enemy? He received a warning through Lennox, his father, of 'a bond' concerning him and his future. On Christmas Eve Mary signed the amnesty for twenty-seven persons concerned in the assassination of Riccio. Stricken with fear Darnley rode away to his home near Glasgow *without* taking leave of the Queen. Falling very ill by the way, he suspected poison, though really he had caught the small-pox. From his father's house he wrote to explain his conduct, saying that Mary allowed him no authority, and that the lords isolated him.

From this time on the plot thickened; issues became more complicated. Two things had been arrived at by the bond-men: (1) the pardon of Morton and his companions; (2) the determination to get rid of Darnley. It now became evident that a third and unsuspected decision had been taken contingent on the execution of the second, and that was the marriage of the Queen with Bothwell.

Lady Blennerhassett lays little stress on a document to which Mary appended her seal on the 23rd of December, the day before Darnley's flight. This document re-established the Catholic Bishop of St. Andrews as primate and legate of

* Philippon, vol. iii. p. 267.

† Ibid. p. 286.

Scotland and included the power of matrimonial jurisdiction.* Is it not very strange that this jurisdiction was restored only to one Catholic bishop in whose diocese were situated Edinburgh and the demesnes of Bothwell? The Privy Council can hardly have been ignorant of this patent, which apparently proves that during the baptismal ceremonies at Stirling Mary was, as M. Philippon says, facing a double perspective, firstly of separation from her husband and secondly of the separation of Bothwell and his wife.† The Bishop of St. Andrews was later on one of the signatories to the Ainslie bond and he it was who annulled the marriage of Lady Bothwell. From this sinister Christmas plot it appeared as though Bothwell had been selected (on account of his Protestantism and of Mary's undoubted passion for him) to be the future instrument of government for the Calvinist confederacy. The situation however is curious and is susceptible of several interpretations.

In January 1567 Bothwell and Maitland went to meet the exile Morton under the Whittinghame yew, and from this time onwards we are uncomfortably persuaded that Morton and Maitland were using Bothwell as a means to an end, i.e. the success of the Protestant party guided by themselves.

M. Philippon thinks that the Queen went to Glasgow two days after the yew-tree conference in order to fetch Darnley away from the plottings of the Lennox family and to reconcile herself at least outwardly with him, fearing his open enmity too much to leave him at Glasgow.‡ He does not credit her with any evil intention, but it is difficult to see any reason for conveying a man ill with the small-pox from his own home to a disused monastery, and the balance of probability lies in the direction of the journey to Glasgow being in execution of some arrangement of which we are not cognisant. Mary was received outside that town with every demonstration of loyalty. In the interview she had with Darnley before supper that night she told him he must be conveyed in the horse-litter she had brought with her to Craigmillar.§ He made affectionate vows, spoke of new intentions and forgiveness for past follies, and the Queen, his wife, gave him her hand in token of reconciliation. On the second evening too they had a long talk, though the air of the room was so 'infecte' that Mary could not endure it more than two hours. She questioned

* Philippon, vol. iii. p. 276. † Ibid. p. 304.

‡ Ibid. p. 284.

§ According to the depositions of Crawford and Nelson he refused to go to Craigmillar and asked to go to Kirk-o'-Field, vol. iii. p. 289.

him as to what rumours had reached him of plots hatched at Craigmillar : she asked him what Lords he hated ; he answered that he hated none. Weak with illness and incapable of resisting his transportation to Craigmillar, he said, throwing himself on her mercy, that he knew ' his own flesh could do ' him no hurt.' This was the moment at which the two important Casket Letters are supposed to have been written—these are the conversations they purport to report. It is Mary's part of kidnapper that they reveal.

We do not propose to say much about these letters, as they are referred to elsewhere in this number (pp. 248-9), but the casket itself was a silver-gilt box, a present made to Mary by her first husband. In June 1567 it was in the keeping of Balfour, friend of Bothwell and commandant of Edinburgh. After Carberry Hill it became public property. Morton and others who scrutinised the contents declared that it contained eight letters in French without date, signature, or address, some poems and two marriage contracts. Only one of the documents is of real importance—Letter II from Glasgow, for it directly implicates the Queen in the murder of Darnley. It is however so like Crawford's report of the proceedings at Glasgow as to be possibly based upon it. Mr. Lang does not believe in integral falsification, but admits the possibility that Lethington and Balfour may have made valuable interpolations. Mr. Henderson opines that Lethington had no time to accomplish so difficult a forgery and that Balfour had no key to the casket. He finds no evidence against, no suspicion of Lethington in contemporary documents. Lord Acton and the German critics believe in the integral authenticity of the letters, but whether we believe in their authenticity or not, Mary, as Lady Blemmerhassett says, is condemned by her actions. It was owing to her persuasion that the sick lad was moved to Edinburgh, and whether she was the consenting and conscious co-operator with the conspirators, as we are obliged after the divorce arrangements to consider probable, or not, she, a woman who had repeatedly expressed her delight in assassination and her gratitude to those who executed or attempted it, drew Darnley to his doom.*

Mary and her husband left Glasgow on the 27th of January and arrived at Edinburgh on the 1st of February. Darnley was conveyed to the western wing of a disused convent of Dominican friars, which stood near the roofless church of Our Lady-in-the-Field close to the walls of Edinburgh. Darnley's

* Lectures on Modern History, vol. i, Lord Acton, pp. 151-2.

bedroom on the first floor was hung with tapestry ; a great bed of brown velvet, ornamented with gold and silver lace, was there for him to lie on, and the floor was covered with a Turkey carpet. A turnpike stair led down to the Queen's room, where a bed of red and yellow damask with a coverlet of marten's fur had been installed. Considering how hastily the house had been put in order it was very comfortable. The Queen slept in her red and yellow bed on Wednesday the 5th and on Friday the 7th February. On this Friday Lord Robert Stuart, one of Mary's half-brothers, who had a pity and a liking for Darnley, warned him there was a plot against his life. Darnley told his wife, who immediately taxed Lord Robert as to his story, thus reassuring her husband.

On the Saturday, Moray, who never obviously inculcated himself, went to his wife at Fife. On the Sunday Mary supped at Sir James Balfour's house with Huntly, Bothwell, Cassilis and the Bishop of the Isles, and after supper went along the dark wynds accompanied by torchbearers to visit Darnley. At about ten o'clock she reached her husband's room and sat beside his bed. Huntly, Argyll, Bothwell and Cassilis played dice, while the Queen talked to the sick youth lying in his taffeta mask on that dark velvet bed. About midnight the Queen rose, and placing a ring upon Darnley's finger kissed him good-night : at the door she turned and said 'It is eleven months to-day since Riccio was slain.' To Darnley, ill and lonely, the words sounded ominous, and he said to his servant Nelson : 'She was very kind : but why did she speak of Davie's slaughter ?' Opening his book of psalms he read aloud Psalm lv. : 'My heart is disquieted within me, and the fear of death is fallen upon me.' Mary meanwhile went back to Holyrood to dance at a masque.

Men and women said afterwards that Darnley's cries for mercy had come to them upon the still night air. His body was found in the field hard by, together with that of a page, Taylor. It seemed that they had tried to escape from the explosion, but that they had been strangled by a person or persons unknown.

When the upholsterers came next morning to hang the widow's rooms with black it was Bothwell who stood in the candlelight conversing with the Queen, who lay abed. Later in the same morning she presided over the Privy Council. During the official inquiry into the crime neither sentinels nor gate-keeper were called to give evidence as to who had come and gone to Kirk-o'-Field that night. Two days later an offer of reward was made ; two thousand pounds and a free pardon were

promised to any informer. No one dared inform. Day after day on the door of the Tolbooth bills were posted accusing Bothwell, Balfour, Chalmers, and Speers of the murder. It was discovered later that Murray of Tullibardine, one of Bothwell's warmest partisans, was the author of this placard and other bills.* No one can doubt that Bothwell murdered Darnley. The nine or ten immediate accomplices may have drawn lots, and the lot may have fallen upon Bothwell. It may be that since he was to reap the reward of apparent kingship through their help he agreed to do the disagreeable work of assassination; also if any other lord had done the deed Bothwell later on could have brought him to justice. However the act had been arrived at, it was settled that Bothwell was to take the throne as the guarantor of the Protestant ascendancy. M. Philippon, viewing Darnley's assassination as a blow at Catholicism, says it was the complementary murder to that of Riccio.† The programme had been made easy of execution by the Queen's passion for Bothwell.

Two days after Darnley's body had been deposited in the vaults of Holyrood, Mary went to Seton, and there she quite threw off any such simulated grief as might have been agreeable to the Privy Council. She played games, went out riding and shooting, and made much of her future consort.

The Queen addressed a letter of condolence to the bereaved Lennox, and, in reply to his demand that the assassins should be brought immediately to justice, said that she had already summoned Parliament 'to punish the terrible murder of her 'husband the King.' The tribunal presided over by Argyll, an accomplice, was faced by Bothwell with perfect equanimity. He rode to his trial on dead Darnley's horse escorted by 4000 mounted men and two hundred of the Queen's arquebusiers. Since Lennox feared to appear, no formal accusation was lodged against him and he was unanimously acquitted. Immediately Parliament by a series of acts restored his possessions to Huntly, and made grants of land to Moray, Morton, Maitland's father and other of Bothwell's associates. The General Assembly of the Church was not so docile. It was convened for the 18th of April and unanimously demanded that the assassins should be brought to justice.

The curtain now rang up on the last scene of the Craigmillar conspiracy to enthrone Bothwell. The day Parliament adjourned Bothwell bade his friends to supper. After

* Philippon, vol. iii. p. 308.

† Ibid. p. 317.

supper a document was produced in which it was laid down that Bothwell had not participated in the murder of Darnley and that he had been justified by the acquittal of the tribunal. The signatories to this document engaged themselves before God to defend Bothwell and to hasten his marriage with Mary should she choose him as husband. Huntly, Argyll, Morton, Cassilis, Seton, fourteen lay lords in all, and eight bishops signed this paper known to history as the Ainslie Bond or the Bond of the Nobility. Murray had prudently slipped off to France.

Things were moving quickly, for on the 24th of April Mary, who was riding with Maitland, Huntly, and an armed escort from Linlithgow to Edinburgh, where she had been visiting the baby son she was never to see again, was intercepted by Bothwell and his men and taken to Dunbar, of which she had just given him command.

Public decorum forbade that a Queen should ostensibly accept an offer of marriage from a man who had made her a widow ten weeks before, wherefore this ambush was devised. On the 27th of April the divorce processes already arranged for were begun; on the 29th the Privy Council, presided over by the Queen, sat at Dunbar. The Commissary court of the kirk granted the Protestant divorce to Bothwell on the 3rd of May, while on the 7th of May the Bishop of St. Andrews exercised his privilege of matrimonial jurisdiction for the first and last time by granting that Catholic annulment to Lady Bothwell for which she had been induced to apply by her brother, Huntly, and his fellow bond-men.

Bothwell was 'publicly forgiven' by Mary and created Duke of Orkney. The marriage took place on the 15th of May, Huntly alone of the bond-men being in attendance. It lasted barely a month, and during that month Mary was consumed with jealousy, for she found that Bothwell despised all women save one, and that one was the wife he had just divorced.

The calculations of everyone concerned in this 'coup d'état' were entirely falsified by a factor with which they had not reckoned. Successful crime requires the seal of public approval, and no one seems to have anticipated the intensity of the popular disapproval aroused by Mary's wedding with her husband's assassin. The horror expressed by foreign ambassadors and by the people of Scotland caused Bothwell's bond-men to reconsider their position. As a result of this reconsideration they decided on an open change of front: to withdraw their nominal support from Bothwell and to

adopt some alternative policy which would involve his overthrow; this they leagued themselves by bond to do.* Mary, who felt the ground slipping away from under her, made a last bid for popularity by revoking permission for the practice of the Catholic religion and by herself abstaining from all acts of worship. To test for herself what authority was still hers she summoned 'her liege lords' to Melrose on the 15th of June, at the same time issuing orders for a levy of troops to be made on the pretext of an expedition against 'the robbers' of the Marches.' No liege lord came to Melrose, and Bothwell and the Queen were assured of that which they already half realised, that no dependence could be placed on the signatories to the Ainslie bond.

To the Calvinist Confederacy, who now, as six years earlier, desired the alliance of England, it mattered not that the Queen was in danger, nor that they had been false to their erstwhile associate. To them the situation represented a great opportunity, and accordingly they took advantage of it.

Mary and Bothwell had gone to Borthwick on the 7th of June, and thither Morton, in ready response to popular feeling, came with a thousand men and more to demand the murderer's blood. Mary spoke with this envoy while her husband escaped. Morton's message was that he and his friends would serve their Queen if she would abandon the King's murderer. In answer she said that he and his friends had pronounced the Duke guiltless, and that she, their Queen, had received him as husband. When Morton had left to convey her reply to his friends, the Queen set out to rejoin Bothwell, and together they took refuge in the impregnable fortress of Dunbar.

Misled by a message from his one-time friend Balfour, governor of Edinburgh,† to the effect that he would co-operate with the royal troops if they marched towards the capital, Bothwell and the Queen set out for Seton, meeting the hostile lords at Carberry hill on the old battlefield of Pinkie. There was no fighting because Mary, afraid for Bothwell's safety, promised to parley with the Lords if only he might be allowed to ride away. They said farewell with longing kisses, never to meet again, and the Queen went with the Lords to Edinburgh. As she rode dusty and dishevelled through the streets of the capital that night she was preceded by a banner on which dead Darnley was depicted, and by his corpse was a kneeling child out of whose mouth the words 'Judge my cause, and avenge me, O Lord!' issued. She had refused food through all the long

* Philippon, vol. iii. p. 381.

† Ibid. p. 390.

June day, and that night cried for rescue to passers by. Her dearest wish was to be placed upon a ship with Bothwell and allowed to drift at the wind's will.

The lords were in a dilemma since the Queen refused to abandon Bothwell. They could in no case reinstate her, for she knew too much. Had not Bothwell told her all his secrets, and had he not given her a paper stating that Morton, Maitland and Balfour had murdered Darnley? They decided at length that she should be incarcerated in Loch Leven Castle, under the custodianship of Moray's mother. On the 17th of June she was imprisoned; on the 25th a General Assembly denounced her as murderess; on the 16th of July she was forced to abdicate, and to appoint Moray as regent; on the 29th her boy was crowned. Nearly a year was spent by Mary most wretchedly in the solitude of Loch Leven Castle. In May 1568 she managed to escape.

Bothwell was abroad, and Mary decided to try to re-assume her former position of queen, in which decision Argyll, Huntly and other lords, as well as nine bishops and many gentlemen, supported her. After revoking her abdication she sent to negotiate with the Regent, who waited till he had got men together, and then declared himself determined to support the cause of the Infant King. Mary was extremely anxious to avoid fighting, as her position was improving every day. She intended to go to Dumbarton and summon Parliament to meet her there. The Hamiltons, who formed her escort, appeared to fall in with her pacific views and to be willing to convey her circuitously to Dumbarton so as to avoid any chance collision with the Regent Moray's troops. They played her false, however, by making straight for Dumbarton by Glasgow, which they knew to be occupied by the Regent, assuring the Queen that they would do their best to avoid any encounter. The Regent's troops were in a position on Camp Hill, close to the village of Langside, and the Hamiltons, in trying to take this hill by assault, were completely routed with the loss of three hundred men. Mary watched the battle, the doom of all her hopes, from the hill of Cathcart. Seeing the day lost she was seized with fear, remembering the night after Carberry Hill, and galloped away, abandoning for ever her cause. Obedient to the impulse of terror she got out of Scotland as quickly as she could, crossing the Solway Firth to Workington in Cumberland.

From the moment that her feet touched English soil she loses all historical significance. She no longer influences events, for she becomes the more or less passive object round which plots and intrigues crystallise.

On the 15th of May she wrote to Elizabeth—the first of many letters—explaining her plight: ‘I hope you will send immediately to see me. All my clothes and necessaries were left behind.’ High Sheriff Lowther conducted her to Carlisle Castle, and the great English lords flocked to see her. Her dignity suffered for want of suitable clothing, and a request made to Elizabeth for help of this kind was answered by a present of cast-off raiment and a few yards of velvet. Lowther received orders on the 20th of May to pay all honour to the Queen, but to allow no one to escape. Mary’s wish was to see Elizabeth and persuade her personally of the justice of her cause; but Elizabeth found her ‘sister’ a great problem, and was for the moment unwilling to compromise herself by precipitate action.

It was impossible, of course, to detain Mary in England without some plausible ground for doing so, and quite as dangerous in its own way as allowing her to remain at large. Elizabeth, however, took a middle course and refused to see her ‘sister’ until she could clear herself of suspicion. Mary wrote impetuously to the English Queen ‘that she would sooner apply to the Grand Turk than renounce vengeance against her rebel subjects.’ Step by step Mary was inveigled into submitting to an indirect adjudication of her cause. Elizabeth pacified her by promising to reconcile Mary and her people once her innocence was established, and at the same time ordered Moray to justify his criminal rebellion. Instead of doing so he asked whether Elizabeth would accept the validity of the Casket Letters if the original French ones were submitted to her and found to tally with the Scotch translations.* He received no direct answer, but covert encouragement, and presently a conference was summoned at York for October to judge Mary. Before Moray decided to bring accusations forward at this Commission of Enquiry he tried to ensure his future by getting answers to three questions: (1) Was a *judgement* at York authorised? (2) In the event of condemnation, would Mary be delivered up to them or kept in England? (3) Would he be confirmed as Regent?

Elizabeth gave a secret affirmative reply to Moray’s questions and disallowed all Mary’s requests to be allowed to face her accusers in open court. The Commission was transferred from York to London and at once became an enquiry into the murder of Darnley and into the reported intention of Mary to kill her son.

* P. 197, ‘Marie Stuart,’ Lady Blennerhassett.

In December Moray produced his accusation—the ‘Book of Articles,’ a series of calumnious insinuations repeated later in Buchanan’s ‘Detectio.’ He enquired whether the English Commissioners were satisfied, and when his enquiry was received in assenting silence he and his partisans withdrew. After a short interval Moray, who even to Lethington seemed to be behaving ignominiously, returned alone with the Casket. The letters within it were examined. They did their work and enabled Elizabeth to treat Mary as a criminal.

Mary was sent to Tutbury, and became interested in the project of a new marriage. Elizabeth, fearing danger, caused the possible partner to be imprisoned in the Tower, thereby dealing Mary and her champions a severe blow. This incarceration of the Duke of Norfolk removed the keystone from the Catholic arch, and made the efforts of Mary’s rescuers rather pointless. In 1570 Pius V excommunicated Elizabeth, declaring she had no right to the throne, and forbidding her subjects to obey her on pain of excommunication. By March 1571 Mary was in communication with the King of Spain, the Duke of Alva and the Pope, to whom she had applied for an annulment, by reason of constraint, of her marriage with Bothwell. Ridolfi, her secret agent, talked a good deal, and Burleigh knew every detail of the conspiracy—knew that if Spain would land an army it was guaranteed that Norfolk would put 23,000 men into the field to co-operate with it; knew of the sixty lords who would back such a scheme; knew that Mary was receiving money from the papal nuncio. Lord Shrewsbury was told to inform her that all her plots were known, and that as a consequence her detention was to be aggravated and her correspondence curtailed. She implored grace for Norfolk, but he was executed, cursing Mary and declaring himself a member of the Church of England.*

By this time Buchanan had published the ‘Detectio,’ and all the world became familiar with his infamous rendering of his pupil’s life. Mary read it in her prison and no doubt made many bitter reflexions on the falseness of men.

In June 1572 odious plans were engaging the minds of Burleigh and Elizabeth, who could not make up their minds to put Mary to death. As the result of their deliberations Burleigh’s son-in-law was sent on a mission to Morton, Mar and Knox, to enquire whether, in the event of Elizabeth surrendering her custodianship of Mary to them, the Lords would engage to

* P. 247, ‘Marie Stuart,’ Lady Blennerhassett.

kill her four hours after arrival, 'to receive that which she had 'deserved there by order of justice.'* Knox did not object to this proposal, Morton wanted another trial and a guarantee of military assistance. Mar wanted money and a defensive alliance with England. The negotiations, however, came to nothing in the end, as Elizabeth, though desirous of assassination, feared revelation.

In 1572 Mary's life practically ended. She was thirty years old, and for the rest of her days remained a closely guarded prisoner. From this time on her attitude changed, and she regarded herself as a martyr to her religion, as the representative of an abused and persecuted faith.

Catholic friends still rallied to her support. In June 1579 Gregory XIII sent five ships and 2000 papal soldiers to Ireland, which was to be the new 'point d'appui' for an attack on England. In the following year a Jesuit campaign was opened in England, and in 1582 Elizabeth managed to persuade the Scots Lords that Mary and Lennox had organised a Catholic conspiracy, into which their King had entered, promising to become a Catholic. On the strength of this suspicion James VI was temporarily imprisoned; but the accusation was quickly disproved and James VI allied himself with Elizabeth in 1585. In the treaty at this time made there was no mention of his mother, Mary. For all he cared she might have been dead. Mary continued her small and pathetic civilities to her gaoler, sending Elizabeth presents of preserved fruits from France and of needlework, but she received nothing in return. Laughingly, she remarked one day '*que les gens qui vieillissent prennent des deux mains 'mais ne rendent que d'un doigt.'*'†

The next few years were interwoven with intrigues. In the unsympathetic English country Mary, the centre of the web of complication, sat writing poetry. Burleigh, tired and angered by the situation, determined to hoist her with her own petard. He sent her to Chartley, and encouraged her to go on with her scheming—the more letters and plots and intrigues the better, for only so could she be finally enmeshed. Walsingham was his willing agent in this matter, and Mary but clay in their hands. All letters issued from Chartley—and some of them were concealed in beer barrels—were seized and the so-called Babington conspiracy was brought to light. Babington and eleven others had bound themselves by oath to foment

* P. 249. 'Marie Stuart,' Lady Blennerhassett.

† Ibid. p. 251.

insurrection in England and to kill Elizabeth. On the 17th of July a letter from Mary to Babington was found, and it became the ground of her condemnation. On the 8th of August, while riding towards Tixall, Mary was arrested; on the 17th of September Babington and others were executed; on the 25th Mary was conveyed to Fotheringhay. Elizabeth wrote to Paulet, custodian of Fotheringhay, 'that she lifted up her hands to Him who alone can save or destroy beseeching Him to deliver from the claws of the demon the better part of this woman who has fallen to assassination.' Of Mary she twice demanded avowal of crime and recourse to her clemency, and twice she was repulsed.

A fortnight after Mary's arrival at Fotheringhay forty-two commissioners and 2000 men, followed at an interval by eight judges, appeared before the Castle. At first Mary would not consent to submit her cause to such an assembly, firstly, because a Queen cannot be judged by subjects, and, secondly, because she could not recognise the laws of England, which had afforded her no protection. In a day or two she was persuaded to appear before her judges. Counsel was refused; no witnesses were called; the commissioners constituted both judge and jury. She was informed that papers and documents would be of no use, as she was to be accused of nothing before the 19th of June of that very year. In short she was to be tried for complicity in the Babington plot. The accusation was read and supported by the Chartley letters. At first Mary said she knew nothing of Babington; the letters produced were avowedly copies; how could she tell if they were genuine or accurate? Where were her own secretaries? Why had they killed the principal witness, Babington? She admitted intercourse with Babington after a while, but *not* conspiracy against Elizabeth's life. The judges listened to passionate accusations and complaints, but there was no sign of weakness, no debasing of queenhood, visible to any witness. Crippled yet queenly, she faced her accusers adjuring the Commissioners who denied her counsel to look to their consciences and to remember that the theatre of the world is wider than the realm of England. She answered Burleigh in his rôle of Crown Prosecutor with spirit and clearness. She had no notes, no secretary and no documents, and said that no man there could defend himself in such circumstances. During the days of trial she was serene in temper, reading the Lives of Saints and discussing English History. Her conscience was at rest: she saw herself a martyr.

Presently the Commissioners disappeared with their evidence, and judgement was pronounced in the starred chamber of

Westminster, Lord Zouche alone among those there declaring himself not satisfied that she had 'compassed or imagined the death of the Queen of England.' Mary was condemned to death. Parliament confirmed the sentence. After a short interval both Houses petitioned that the sentence should be executed. Elizabeth begged them to reconsider the matter and to devise some better remedy. After fresh deliberation they repeated their request, and forthwith Lord Buckhurst was despatched to Fotheringhay to acquaint the Queen of Scots of the judgement. Elizabeth shrank from signing the death warrant although she had caused the sentence to be proclaimed to the sound of a trumpet throughout the Kingdom. The sword hung suspended over Mary's head for several weeks, but at last on the 1st of February at Greenwich the Queen of England signed the warrant of execution, as it were inadvertently, amongst other State papers. She thought herself very badly served in that no one had privily killed Mary.

Desolation gives courage, and Mary, 'destitute of all aid and advice but that of God, felt cheerfulness and strength.' When Lord Buckhurst had broken to her that she was condemned to die for consent to and authorship of rebellion she said :

'I expected nothing else . . . I do not fear death and shall suffer it with a good heart. I have never been the *author* of any conspiracy to injure the Queen . . . For my part, I am weary of being in this world ; nor do I, or any one else, profit by my being here.'

Eleven weeks later, when the Earls of Kent and Shrewsbury came to tell her that she was to die the following morning, she received the message quietly and said 'It is the road to heaven.'

Mary's worst enemy must admit that she died admirably. In a farewell letter to Mendoza she said with the same irony and detachment with which she was able to take farewell of her suite : 'They are working in my hall ; I think they are making a scaffold to make me play the last scene of the tragedy.'

Mary wrote letters on the evening before her death, signing her name for the last time to a letter to Henry III at 2 A.M., six hours before the time appointed for the ceremony of execution. Then she lay still upon her bed. Her attendants observed that her lips moved and that she smiled peacefully. Jane Kennedy called it 'laughing with the angels.'

Mary's dignity in the supreme moment was magnificent; exalted beyond fear or hope in the assurance that she, herself but a poor sinner, was admitted to that deathless roll of men and women who have been privileged to shed their blood for the Catholic faith.

She commended her spirit to God kneeling, and a moment later a piece of rough woollen stuff, snatched from the billiard table, covered the quivering remains of this unhappy Queen.

The personal note silences all contention, and though as students of history we ought to be considering the public consequences of her execution in the quieting of conspiracy and rebellion, yet as human beings we only find ourselves wondering whether death ever justifies life.

The green mounds of Fotheringhay look as remote from tragic happenings as the sheep that browse upon their slopes. All the Stuarts were ill-starred from the cradle, and we may say with Voltaire that if anything could justify fatalism it would be the tragic history of their house.

ART. X.—OUR TUDOR KINGS.

1. *The History of England from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of Henry VIII (1485-1547)*. By H. A. L. FISHER, M.A. (Political History of England, Vol. V.) London: Longmans. 1906.
2. *The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603)*. By A. F. POLLARD, M.A. (Political History of England, Vol. VI.) London: Longmans. 1910.
3. *Henry VIII*. By A. F. POLLARD, M.A. 2nd Edition.* London: Longmans. 1905.

IT is a great work which Dr. Hunt has brought to a happy conclusion: the 'History of England' from the earliest date to the present time, in twelve goodly octavo volumes. The age has gone past when it was supposed that one man could write such a book, with full knowledge of every period; and as in the excellent history of France, now appearing under the direction of Monsieur Ernest Lavisse, so in England Dr. Hunt has properly availed himself of the services and the expert knowledge of many assistants, himself taking the important and interesting period from 1760 to 1801. To say that we find the volumes unequal; that, at times, we almost doubt whether the choice of contributors was the best, is merely to say that all men do not see things in the same light; and besides, it may very well be that the alternatives which suggest themselves were not available. Dr. Hunt has a large experience both as writer and editor; and as past president of the Royal Historical Society is in touch with all the historical talent of the country; so that we may very well leave the matter as to him it has seemed best. The volumes are most acceptable as they are, not only as presenting to us within a reasonable compass the life-labour of many specialists—Freeman, Green, Wyllie, Gardiner, Lecky and others—but giving us, in the volumes which we have more particularly named above, the fullest and most satisfactory history of the Tudors which we yet have.

An exhaustive history, such as we possess of the early Stuarts or Hanoverians, remains a desideratum. Dr. Gairdner, catching up the mantle of the late Dr. Brewer, and with the later assistance of Mr. Brodie, has given us the invaluable 'Calendar of Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic'; but these, in

* First published in the Goppil Illustrated Series, in 1902.

themselves, do not offer a connected story ; and if they did, their bulk puts them out of reach of the average reader ; added to which they deal only with the reign of Henry VIII, not yet finished. There are many other collections which are of great importance, the whole of which have to be boiled down to make a palatable volume. The process of reducing the reign of Elizabeth is similar, and we have in these two volumes, by Mr. Fisher and Professor Pollard, the essence of a vast number of collections which treat of the Tudor family and its hold on the throne of England. The story is one of extreme and ever living interest ; it ranges over the period in which England, emerging from barbarism and disorder, regulated her own affairs and prepared to start on her career of colonisation and extension. That much of her history in later and modern times may be considered as fashioned by the stamp put upon her during this century, greatly increases its importance.

But first of all, who were the Tudors and how did they come to the throne ? Nothing can well be more unsatisfactory than the everyday story. The battle of Bosworth, it is said, was a final victory for the House of Lancaster ; and the Parliament, as in duty bound, elected Henry of Richmond to the vacant throne. Why ? The reason commonly given is most confused. We know that Henry had been recognised, for several years, as the representative of the Lancastrian line, and that Edward IV had been naturally anxious to get hold of him. It is generally understood that Henry represented the Lancastrian family by right of his mother. But that mother was still living ; moreover she was descended from an illegitimate line ; and though this had been legitimatised, it had also, though perhaps irregularly, been barred from the succession to the throne. Whether the irregularity was known or understood, is very doubtful ; it would seem that Henry was far from sure, and at any rate, he is not found explaining his hereditary claim.

It may be suspected that he was chosen as the representative of the Lancastrian party because his father, Edmund Tudor, was half-brother of Henry VI and had been favourably known at court. It is quite evident to us that any claim on this count had no genealogical value ; that he was no relation to the throne, even if his birth was legitimate, which was and is uncertain. Nor was it even noble on the father's side. Putting aside the Welsh pedigree, formulated afterwards, and of scarcely doubtful value, his grandfather was steward or butler to the Bishop of Bangor. The butler's son,

Owen Tudor, came as a young man to seek his fortune at the

court of Henry V. and obtained a clerkship of the wardrobe to Henry's Queen, Catherine of France. So skilfully did he use or abuse this position of trust, that he won the heart of his mistress; and within a few years of Henry's death his widowed Queen and her clerk of the wardrobe were secretly, and possibly without legal sanction, living together as man and wife. The discovery of their relations resulted in Catherine's retirement to Bermondsey Abbey and Owen's to Newgate prison. The Queen died the following year, but Owen survived many romantic adventures. . . . Finally, on the outbreak of the Wars of the Roses, he espoused the Lancastrian cause, and was beheaded by order of Edward IV after the battle of Mortimer's Cross.' (*Henry VIII.*, p. 5.)

Edmund, his eldest son, was brought up at court, was formally legitimatised in 1453, was enriched by the grant of broad estates, and enrolled among the members of Henry's Council, and, by the royal wish, married in 1455 to Margaret Beaufort, daughter of John, first Duke of Somerset, and niece of that Duke of Somerset who had been killed the year before at the battle of St. Albans. Of itself, and without the high position which Edmund held at court, such a pedigree would scarcely have been sufficient to cause the son of Margaret to be recognised as the head of the Lancastrian line on the death of Henry VI and his reputed son Edward, though it will account for Edward IV's desire to get hold of the boy, then fourteen, and the necessity the boy was under of taking refuge in Brittany. When Richard III had made himself impossible, many of the Yorkists feeling the difficulty of putting the Lady Bessie, Edward's eldest daughter, on the throne by herself, came to an agreement with young Henry to support his claims, on the clear understanding that he would marry the Yorkist princess.

How far this was an open secret to the bulk of the people, which was neither Yorkist nor Lancastrian, is not known, but that large bodies of the rival factions accepted it as a fair compromise may be admitted, and after the battle of Bosworth and the death of Richard III there was no other possible claimant; for the Earl of Warwick, the son of the Duke of Clarence, was a mere child, and the Earl of Lincoln, a sister's son, who had been recognised as heir by Richard III, was only twenty, was overwhelmed in the defeat at Bosworth, and in no case to offer opposition to Henry at the head of a victorious army. Henry was advised that to claim the crown by conquest would alienate his Yorkist partisans; that claim was therefore not put forward, but it surely was perfectly well understood by the members of Parliament and the body of the people. There was no army nor leader of an army to oppose

him, and the Parliament decided that if the fighting men of the kingdom would not oppose him, it was not for them to do so. To say, as is often said, that they cared not who was king, if only he was a strong man, who could keep peace and enforce law, is beyond the question. Of Henry, at the time, they could know nothing, except that the fortune of battle had declared in his favour, and Richard being dead, they elected him without further to-do, reserving to themselves the right of favouring any other claimant when the season was more propitious. But it did not take them long to find out that they could scarcely have a better man than Henry. 'The Tudors,' says Professor Pollard, 'were probably more at home on the English throne than most of England's kings, and their humble and British origin may have contributed to their unique capacity for understanding the needs, and expressing the mind, of the English nation.' Neither the Valois nor the Plantagenets seem to have transmitted any of their marked characteristics through the female line; whether in the great grandfather, the butler, or in the grandfather, the clerk of the wardrobe, we may trace the tact, caution, care, judgement, determination, force, which distinguished Henry and his son or his son's daughter must be a moot point. Their characters are too hazy to permit us to form a clear opinion. But one thing definitely appears: what was necessary to Henry to secure his throne was exactly what the people needed to secure peace and law: the depression of the noble houses, the prohibition, and the enforcement of the prohibition, of 'livery and maintenance,' of the upholding of large gangs of armed retainers. Thus the Earl of Lincoln's rebellion met with scant support from the people, and was easily overcome; thus the bubble of Perkin Warbeck had only to show itself in England to be pricked; thus the bands of retainers were suppressed and the Court of Star Chamber was reorganised; thus men of modest birth and station were chosen as ministers; thus the capital sentences for treason were unsparing and those who escaped were by heavy fines rendered harmless, and to the people at large it all seemed very good.

In every rank of command the man who leaves the duties of his command to his subordinates makes a sure bid for trouble and sorrow, and in the fourteenth and fifteenth century a king was expected to reign—*regnare*. Henry VI had been unable to 'reign,' and much dool descended on his unfortunate kingdom in consequence. In his exile Henry of Richmond had had time to ponder over the lesson, and was in no danger of calling on others to do his work. His rule has been named

arbitrary. To some extent it was, but not in the way that is often supposed.

‘It is true enough that Parliaments were summoned less regularly under the Tudor than under the Lancastrian sovereigns, and that the Crown was frequently at pains to influence not only the composition but also the deliberations of the legislature. It is true that the country squires, the recorders and aldermen of the country towns, who came to these Parliaments, possessed little general information upon affairs of State, and were for the most part content to accept the guidance of the Crown and the Lords of the Council through the political mysteries. But the survival of parliamentary government in England, in an age which witnessed the eclipse of representative institutions throughout Western Europe, is in itself a fact of great significance. These English Parliaments kept alive all the forms and something of the spirit of political liberty. If their outlook upon the field of general politics was narrow, the interest of the members in local affairs was close and keen. The drafting of bills might be left to the Lords of the Council; the direction of foreign policy might safely be entrusted to the princely wisdom of the Sovereign; but wherever there was an organised trade interest, then the members concerned in that interest would advance it so far as they might in Parliament. Statutes would be passed regulating the most trivial details and in protection of the most restricted and local interests.’ (*Fisher*, pp. 6-7.)

But one set of public interests they were always keenly attentive to—the grants of money; and Henry at once learnt, if he had not been taught before, that, if he wished things to go smoothly in his relations with his Parliaments, the less frequently he had to ask them for money, the better; and this may be taken as the explanation of the often repeated statement, made in varying words, that he was greedy, mean, grasping, avaricious. It was not so much that he loved money as that, by instinct economic, he realised, as few other of our kings except Elizabeth have realised, that money is the key of government; that the king who is independent of money-grants holds the power. And thus the demands of Henry were few and such as could not be objected to.

‘Tonnage and poundage were granted for life for the defence of the realm and specially for the “safeguard and keeping of the sea.” An Act of resumption restored to the Crown all the lands which had belonged to Henry VI on October 2, 1455, save only in exceptions duly specified, and this huge present was augmented by the confiscated property of the King’s attainted enemies.’ (*Ibid.* p. 9.)

But in doing this Parliament guarded itself from any suspicion of establishing a precedent. The granting tonnage and poundage was not to be taken as an ‘ensample to kings of England in

'time to come,' and they protested strongly against the abuse of purveyance.

'Economic instincts were strong in the Tudor race, and Henry, to meet the grievances of the Commons, devised a scheme of appropriation, which was accepted by both Houses. A sum of £14,000 derived from land and custom dues was to be allocated every year to the needs of the King's household, and an annual assignment of £2105 19s. 11d. was made to the wardrobe. The revenues of the King's household were thus severed from the revenues of the State.'

The economic history of Henry's reign is, in fact, the most interesting, though perhaps not the most exciting or most romantic part of it, and while other writers have sketched the general story of the reign, of the several conspiracies, of the statutes, as the celebrated *De facto* one, or of the short wars, diplomatically brought to a close, we know of nothing that, in a succinct form, so clearly explains the commercial treaties of the reign: why the 'Intercursus Magnus' was *magnus*; why, by the Dutch at any rate, the 'Intercursus Malus' might rightly be called *malus*; and above all, the various ways in which the King raised money, without taxation, without incurring public hatred; although, indeed, he left his unfortunate but unscrupulous agents to bear the odium and to suffer the penalty. When, at the age of fifty-four, Henry VII died, a worn-out old man, he left his son a hoard of 'in bullion' 4,500,000l., beside his plate, jewels, and rich attire,' sufficient to give him a start, sufficient to have brought him well into and through his reign, had he followed the rigid parsimony of his father. But in wars of glory-panting and ambition, in shows, in tournaments and pageants, much of this hoard was wasted, and at a comparatively early period of Henry VIII's reign, the accumulations of Henry VII were dissipated.

One only thing remained—a navy, which the first Tudor had done something for, and which, from the beginning, the second took in hand. There was here real achievement, to which Mr. Fisher does scant justice, apparently because he has attempted to judge by a modern standard. 'The royal navy,' he says, 'was still in a rudimentary stage of development. There was no permanent staff of naval officers; the crews were collected for each voyage and disbanded at the end.' It would almost seem that Mr. Fisher is labouring under the impression that at that date there was a permanent staff of army officers and that soldiers were enlisted for long service. For both sea and land, the practice was the same. Again, 'the King was still, in times of war, dependent upon external sources of supply, upon pressed merchantmen and

'the quotas of the Cinque Ports.' So it continued in a greater or lesser degree as long as ships were built of wood, and is assuredly not entirely obsolete even now. But again, the build of the ships was very faulty.

'The King's ships with their towering castles at bows and stern, their enormous sails, their crowds of soldiers and sailors, were too unwieldy to face a heavy sea or to stand the strain of a winter cruise. Even in the summer months, the navy, partly from faults of structure and partly because it was dependent for its supplies upon an attendant fleet of small victualling vessels, was unable to exert a continuous pressure upon any part of the enemy's coast. . . . However superior might be its tonnage, its artillery, or the valour of its bowmen, it could not expect to destroy a rival navy or even to blockade a hostile port.'

All which, if it has any meaning at all, means that the ships of the early half of the sixteenth century could not do effectively what was not done, and then to the astonishment of Europe, till two hundred and fifty years later; though even as it was, Howard off Brest kept up a form of blockade, accompanied by ravages of landing parties, which was highly inconvenient to the French. Of the subsequent fight, and the deadly burning of the two ships, English and French, Mr. Fisher's account is quite inadequate. Howard's rash and disastrous attempt in the following year to cut out the French galleys in '*Les Blanches Sablons*,' or Whitsand Bay, is altogether misplaced. In quoting from inferior sources Mr. Fisher does not appear to have noted that the letter of the French commander, Prigent de Bidoux, is given at length by Spont, to whose work reference is elsewhere made.

It is, perhaps, not too much to say that of Henry VIII the ordinary reader knows little beyond the facts that he married six wives and freed England from the religious rule of the Pope. Of course he did much more, but the great interest of his reign, both at the time and for future generations, beyond doubt centres in his quarrel with the papacy, the culminating features of which were the rejection of the papal supremacy and the dissolution of the monasteries. It is familiarly known that the occasion of all this was the demand which he formulated and insisted on for the annulling of his first marriage: a demand which on his part the Pope was in no position to grant. It may, however, be very much questioned whether this was the principal cause of the ultimate separation of the two Churches. The idea was not an altogether new one. From the earliest times the kings of the English had refused to consider themselves as subjects or dependents of the Pope, though

fully accepting his spiritual supremacy. John's submission altered this, and Henry III suffered in consequence; but his son claimed the old freedom, and showed scant courtesy to the clerics when they claimed exemption from taxation. Under Edward III the statutes of 'Provisors' and of 'Præmunire' were evidence of the way in which the papal claims still galled; and they would pretty certainly have been acted on had not the frequent or possible difference between the King and the barons rendered the support of the Church necessary to the Crown. And so it continued, though many references in our literature of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries show that popular respect to the Church, as distinct from respect to religion, was often wanting.

Under Henry VIII the Church was no longer needed to strengthen the Crown against the barons, and might go. It was felt by many that a disproportionate quantity of land was grasped by the 'dead hand' of the Church, and was thus doing no good to the Crown nor to the many laymen who thought they could make much better use of it. And this again was an old grievance. It is now, indeed, very generally believed that the Dissolution was first imagined by Cromwell, or at least that he was following a bad example set by his former master. But as Mr. Fisher points out:

'The notion that Church property was a thing too sacrosanct to be touched had never been uncontested even in the ages most conspicuous for faith. Under Edward II twenty-three preceptories of the Templars had been dissolved, and their lands only partly restored to religious uses. In 1410 the Commons had petitioned for the confiscation of all the property of the Church. A little later the property of the alien priories, which had been more than once sequestrated during the French wars, was seized by Henry V and partly devoted to schools and other monasteries. William of Wykeham and Chichele, Waynflete and Fisher, Alcock of Ely and Smith of Lincoln, had all diverted wealth from monastic into educational channels, and this idea of utilising conventual revenues for the promotion of learning and culture had been carried out on a large and impressive scale by Wolsey. Nor was this the only way in which the wealth of the monasteries was attacked. Pensions and corrodies upon monastic estates were frequently granted by the Crown and formed a convenient method for rewarding officials and courtiers. Indeed, a general idea had arisen that the monks had more wealth than was good for them or for the country, and that the Mortmain Acts having failed of their designed effect, some measure of secularisation was inevitable.'

And quite irrespective of these instances, Mr. Fisher adduces interesting proof that something much more cogent had been

suggested under Henry VII. He quotes at some length and comments on a treatise written by Edmund Dudley for Henry VIII in the first year of the young King's reign, which shows clearly enough that the wholesale spoliation of the monasteries had been contemplated at least forty years before it actually took place.

'There is no more interesting commentary,' says Mr. Fisher, 'upon Henry VII's reign than this treatise from one of his leading councillors, revealing as it does not only many malpractices in Church and State but also the existence of unrealised plans of fiscal aggression. "Restrain yourself," says the author, addressing the young King, "from appropriation of benefices or to unite any house of religion to another, for if this do continue it shall by all likelihood destroy the honour of the Church of England." It would seem from this that the wealth of the monasteries had been attracting the attention of the royal council, and that a scheme was on foot for monastic consolidation, with a view to the appropriation of the revenues of the smaller houses. It was not an unnatural idea to float before the minds of such men as Empson and Dudley. For them, the Church was already fair prey. "Your progenitors," writes Dudley, "used much to write to their subjects spiritual and temporal for to have the disposition of their promotions, which was a great discouragement for clerks." The King sold patronage, appointed bishops, enjoyed the revenues of vacant sees, and employed ecclesiastical benefices as the rewards for secular services. And why should the King's appetite be stayed here? Why should he not reach out his hand towards the tempting platter of monastic opulence?'

What was contemplated by Henry VII's ministers, what was actually tried by Wolsey, might very well be sanctioned by Henry VIII and fully performed by Cromwell. And after all, it is the way it was done and the way the proceeds were lavished, rather than the thing itself, that is to be reprobated. The monastic institution had outlived its period; it had become an anachronism and called aloud for dissolution; but the treasure and the land ought not to have been dissipated as they were. And most of all, the scandalous enquiry which in reality served no necessary purpose; for the King had decided on the measure quite three years before the execution of it.

'As early as March 1533 Henry had let out in a conversation to Chapuys that he was determined and bound by his coronation oath to unite to the Crown the goods which churchmen held of it. When Henry made a voyage of exploration across that strange ocean, his conscience, he generally returned with an argosy. The intentions of the King were handled by rumour, declaring that

spoliation was inevitable, but uncertain of the form which spoliation would take. In January 1534 Chapuys reported to his master that the King intended to usurp part of the Church's goods and to distribute the remainder to the nobles, adding that benefices would be given to laymen. The intelligence was confirmed in September by no less a person than Cromwell himself, who said that he understood that at the next Parliament the King would distribute the greater part of the ecclesiastical revenues among the gentlemen of the kingdom to gain their support,'

and much more to the same effect. This seems to be outlined by Henry himself, not by Cromwell, and would probably have been forced through Parliament had not Cromwell possibly suggested that persuasion would be better, and devised the slimy and loathsome way that was actually adopted. But already the existing faults in Church establishments and in Church discipline were widely known, not, perhaps, without exaggeration. Mr. Fisher has rightly devoted many and most important pages to elucidating and illustrating this. There was a very common belief that the Church was grasping: mortuary dues were exacted with a strictness that was felt to be oppressive and was often cruel.

'If a man died in one parish and had a household in another, a mortuary would be claimed in both places, and until the mortuary was paid the curate would decline to bury the body. . . . Mortuaries were now claimed in many places where they had been previously unknown, and they were taken in such a manner that it made the people to think that the curates loved their mortuaries better than their lives.'

Similarly, tithes were levied with a harassing rigour. 'It was complained that the curates exacted increased payments 'at marriages, burials, and obits, and that they refused to 'housel parishioners who owed them money.' It is not to be supposed that this was at all the general rule among the clergy; but just as a small crystal of permanganate of potash will discolour a large jug of clear water, so one bad example among the clergy will make more noise than fifty good ones, and thus a belief in the harshness of clerical money-grabbing and in the immorality of the clergy was widespread.

But the circumstances of the King's quarrel with the papacy and of his victory over what had rightly seemed a great and terrible force strengthened the idea, natural in his mind, of his own abounding power. How much of this came from himself, how much from Cromwell, may be doubted. It has been often supposed that it came mainly from Cromwell, and to him the 'Reign of Terror' which it ushered in has been

attributed. That Cromwell was ingenious, able, bold and unscrupulous may be conceded: that with a different adviser, whose ability was controlled by moral scruples, Henry would never have forced the position cannot be certainly said. It may be that the death of the adviser would have marked the personal impolicy of not advising what the King wanted; as, in fact, Cromwell was to find out some years later. As it was, and at the time, the two seem to have agreed very well. And so, from 1534 to 1540, a period 'conterminous with the 'ascendency of Thomas Cromwell in the councils of the King,' is a period of terror 'happily unique in the annals of England.'

'It was not an unparliamentary period . . . but it was a despotic period, gloomy in comparison with the brilliant morning of the reign, and marked by an ever-thickening atmosphere of suspicion, violence, and plunder. "Master Cromwell," said Sir Thomas More, "you are now entered into the service of a most noble, wise, and liberal prince; if you will follow my poor advice, you shall, in your counsel-giving to his Grace, ever tell him what he ought to do, but never what he is able to do. . . . For if a lion knew his own strength, hard were it for any man to rule him." The lion, who had shaken off the Pope, began to comprehend the vast proportions of his strength. He had pushed his way through a jungle of desperate and thorny perplexity, and found himself at last, breathless and a little surprised, saluting the clear, untried horizon. At first he was nervous, dreaded every rustle of the breeze. Could it really be so easy? Was there not peril lurking in every quarter? Then he roared and things submissively quivered, stamped and things quietly died, until it was lodged in the very marrow of his being that he was indeed the lion of God and a law unto himself.' (*Fisher*, p. 328.)

Professor Pollard does not take quite the same view of this terrible period. He does not admit the 'despotism,' though the difference is one rather of words than of meaning. Henry made—he would say—a considerable advance towards despotism, but his rule could not be called so, for after all he only 'enforced his authority with the weapons which Parliament 'had placed in his hands.' Thus Elizabeth Barton, More, Fisher, and many others were put to death 'attainted of 'treason by Act of Parliament.' Thus 'new treasons were 'enacted, and any one who called the King a heretic, schismatic, 'tyrant, infidel, or usurper, was rendered liable to the heaviest 'penalty which the law could inflict.' According to this, Henry only did what Parliament allowed or, in fact, ordered him to do; and the apparent despotism lies in the fact that there was a remarkable agreement between the desires of Henry and his Parliament. Mr. Fisher's view, which seems to us

more consonant with the evidence, is that Parliament ordered what Henry wanted, and did, in fact, want, in the main, what Henry wanted, because the members were virtually chosen by the King's agents, as men who would be influenced by the King's wishes. Mr. Pollard thinks that the refusal made by the Parliament in 1523 to grant the subsidy demanded by Wolsey is a proof that it was not the subservient body sometimes described, and that—in 1529 and in 1547 for instance—the elections were free. That however is merely a manner of speaking, at variance, we think, with facts related by himself.

‘The general tendency had for more than a century been towards close corporations, in whose hands the parliamentary franchise was generally vested, and consequently towards restricting the basis of popular representation. The narrower that basis became, the greater the facilities it afforded for external influence. In many boroughs, elections were largely determined by recommendations from neighbouring magnates, territorial or official.’ (*Henry VIII*, p. 253.)

And the concrete instances which he describes in detail fully bear out the statements. ‘But,’ he adds, ‘these nominations were not royal.’ It may be thought that if a sheriff or other official magnate did not take the King's pleasure as to the nomination, he would not long continue to hold his office; and possibly that, under the same conditions, the very life of a territorial magnate would not be such as a modern insurance office would value as normal.

When brought into juxtaposition with the great ecclesiastical change, everything else in the reign of Henry VIII is dwarfed: the organisation of the navy, important as it was, could not have been long deferred, and especially in view of the then state of Europe, whether the leading idea in the King's mind was ‘the balance of power,’ in which the English navy held the scales, or the reconquest of Guienne, which might depend on a happy alliance with the Emperor. But treaties, alliances, wars, truces, treasons and rebellions are as nothing compared with the change brought about by that series of acts and statutes which moulded the history of the next four centuries, a change which was made so thoroughly that not even Mary could unmake it—Mary, in whom the determined and masterful spirit of the Tudors, the ruthless savagery of her father's maternal, her mother's paternal ancestors,* joined with the frenzied and

* Edward IV, brother of Richard III, and great-great-grandson of Peter the Cruel; Ferdinand, John II of Aragon.

hysterical fanaticism of a deserted woman. The Protestant legislation of her brother she could and did undo without difficulty. Mary's Parliaments were as ready to repeal the Protestant statutes as those assembled under the influence of Somerset or Northumberland had been to enact them. Mr. Pollard's favourite contention is that there is no evidence of royal interference in the elections; and that, although he says :

'Mary now resorted to Northumberland's expedient, and sent round letters to the lord-lieutenants and sheriffs requiring them to admonish the electors to choose representatives "of their inhabitants, as the old laws require, and of the wise, grave, and Catholic sort." She did not apparently suggest any names, but some of the lord-lieutenants were not so scrupulous, and a passionate oration addressed to Elizabeth at her accession speaks of Mary's denial of freedom of election, the choice of knights and burgesses by force of threats, and the extrusion of members lawfully returned.'

That may be, from one point of view, 'the rhetorical exaggeration of the defeated party': from another, it may be adduced as strong evidence: but even if we reject it, when we find the Parliaments of Edward passing Acts intensely Protestant, and the Parliaments of Mary repealing them, and re-enacting the old laws against heresy, it does not need legal evidence, which from the nature of the case could scarcely be forthcoming, to assure us that royal influence was certainly at work both in the elections and in the legislation. This in the beginning of Mary's reign was undoubtedly popular. The bigoted Protestantism of Somerset and Northumberland had disgusted a large majority of the people, who without caring whether the supremacy lay with the Pope or the Sovereign, greatly preferred the doctrine and the ritual which they had learned as children and had believed or practised all their lives. The accession of Mary was thus distinctly popular, and might have continued so if she had not determined on marrying her cousin Philip. This Spanish marriage raised a storm of hostility which culminated in Wyatt's rebellion—a movement which, if religious at all, was so in but a very slight degree. The sense of Englishmen had refused to curtail the electing power of Parliament by any statute corresponding to the so-called *Salic Law* of France; but there was in England, as there had been in France, the same dislike of a foreign king being introduced, even under the name of king consort.

'Jealousy of foreign interference,' says Mr. Pollard, 'was the fiercest English passion. . . . It alone enabled Henry VIII to bid defiance to the Pope and brave the displeasure of the Emperor; and

by an appeal to it Northumberland had hoped to cover his ambition and his crimes. While the natural antipathy to foreigners was the natural ally of the Protestants, Catholics were not by any means exempt from the feeling; Gardiner himself . . . was averse from the match, and at least a third of the Privy Council abetted his strenuous opposition. There were, of course, advantages in the alliance. To most foreign statesmen and to many timorous Englishmen, England seemed fated to come within the orbit of either the Hapsburg or the Valois monarchy, and between these two the Hapsburg was the less unpopular choice. So far as the nation had any conscious predilection in foreign policy, it was attached to the traditional Burgundian alliance; and an imperial ambassador in Henry's reign had calculated that half the population depended directly or indirectly for subsistence upon the wool-market of the Netherlands. Englishmen were alarmed at the progress of French influence in Scotland, and at French designs on Ireland and Calais; and not a few felt that in the Hapsburg alliance lay their only protection. The force of these arguments was, however, weakening. The development of England's manufactures was lessening her dependence on Flanders, and Philip II was not Burgundian. Charles V had been born a Fleming but died a Spaniard; his son was purely Spanish, and Spain did not offer the attractions of the Netherlands. While the Flemish wool market was opened on exceptionally favourable terms to English goods, the Spanish Main was closed to English enterprise. Racial, religious, and commercial sympathy was lacking between England and the Netherlands. Keen as had been the desire for a male heir to the throne in Henry's reign, there was no enthusiasm now for a Spanish king-consort, nor for the prospect of an heir whose blood would be three-quarters Spanish.'

The people, however, though thoroughly disliking the arrangement, were not disposed to fight against it, and Wyatt and his friends found themselves left to the vengeance of the exasperated and relentless Queen—a vengeance which was made to include the unfortunate Lady Jane, not, as far as we can judge, for any new offence, but to convince the Emperor that Mary's seat on the throne was secure. The marriage was duly performed; the third Parliament was elected, and Mary settled down to the work to which she felt herself specially called. She immediately found that she was up against a stone wall; that the Parliament was not unwilling to repeal much of the anti-papal legislation of Henry VIII, but refused even to weaken any of the enactments involving money or land. The initial part of her scheme for the restoration of the old religion and the authority of the Pope was the repeal of the attainder of Cardinal Pole and his reception as Archbishop of Canterbury. But it was understood that Pole held that the first step toward the

re-entering of the nation into the papal fold must be the restitution of Church property ; and to this Parliament would not assent. The nation had no ardent longing for the papal fold, but it was fixed in its resolve to maintain the *status quo* of the property ; and to simplify the matter, the Parliament determined that Pole should not come to England, either in the capacity of papal legate or as archbishop, till they knew that he not only would not demand the cession of Church lands but was prepared to confirm the present tenure of them.

‘ This was the root of the matter ; the English would not admit Pole or the Pope except on condition that their material gains from the Reformation were placed beyond the reach of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Pole was not required to say that the nation had done right in spoiling the Church, but he was allowed no means of expressing his sense of its sin except by a fruitless appeal to its conscience. This was the true measure of England’s repentance, and it cut Pole to the quick to have to grant absolution to a sinner who stipulated that he was not to suffer for his sins. He had no choice : after all there would be compensations ; and the details of the bargain, which was soon embodied in Acts of Parliament, were arranged before Pole started from Brussels.’

And at that it remained. All else Mary could remedy, but the money interests of the well-to-do she could not touch on ; and her hysteric longing for a complete reunion was but very inadequately slaked by the holocausts which she offered to the angry Deity of her diseased imagination—more horrible than the mythical sacrifices of her woad-stained ancestors. This was the real Reformation. When Mary came to the throne the majority of the people were probably Catholic in religion and careless as to the supremacy. When Mary sank into a wretched and dishonoured grave, the majority had come to believe that a religion which taught that such atrocities as they had witnessed were acceptable to God was a devil’s religion, and that the presiding priest was the devil’s minister. From that time, and till within living memory, it was part of the creed of the greater number of Englishmen that ‘ Papist ’ was but another name for an unclean and dangerous beast.

That Elizabeth had escaped the slaughter was not due to any scruple or sisterly affection on the part of Mary. There was, indeed, small reason for her feeling anything but hatred for the daughter of Anne Boleyn, or any scruple in removing one who would otherwise possibly succeed to the throne and undo what little she might be able to accomplish. With Elizabeth gone, a good Catholic would take her place and, backed by the

power of France, would extirpate the abominable heresy. There can be no doubt that when Elizabeth was sent to the Tower in March 1554 she was in the very greatest danger.

‘She might well quail as the gates closed behind her, for few suspected traitors emerged thence except on their way to the scaffold, and Renard was moving all the Powers to procure her execution. Mary would never be safe, he urged, so long as Elizabeth lived; nor, he knew, could Philip succeed to the English throne, in spite of the pedigree which was produced before Parliament, showing his descent from John of Gaunt, so long as Elizabeth stood in the way.’

Whether she had been accessory to Wyatt’s plot or not was not known; probably she was not taking any part in it; but Renard wrote that even if her guilt should be proved, the Lords ‘would not dare to proceed against her for the love of the admiral, her relative, who espouses her quarrel, and has at present all the force of the kingdom in his power.’ ‘That proof,’ adds Professor Pollard, ‘was not forthcoming; and without some evidence more plausible than that produced against Elizabeth, suspects were not executed in England, even under Tudor sovereigns’: a statement which might be characterised as somewhat bold on the part of the biographer of Henry VIII. Elizabeth was, however, not brought to the block, but was sent, still a prisoner, to Woodstock, where she was detained for several months till released by the good offices of Philip, who did not share Mary’s wish to see her Scottish namesake as the successor to the English throne, and French influence dominant in England. She was then allowed to take up her abode at Hampton Court and afterwards at Hatfield—always with a sense of danger—till on November 17, 1558, she received the news of Mary’s death. Not certain that it was not a trap to catch a heretic traitor, she sent to ascertain if the news was true; but before her messenger could return ‘a deputation of the Lords of the Council arrived at Hatfield and greeted their new Queen. Elizabeth stood for a moment irresolute. Then, falling on her knees, she exclaimed: “This is the Lord’s doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.”’* A touching exclamation, showing most clearly how intense had been the strain which this death removed.

And thus, with a sense of relief pervading the whole kingdom, and the highest hopes of the Protestant party, began the reign of Elizabeth. But no one knew exactly what Elizabeth’s

* Creighton’s ‘Queen Elizabeth,’ p. 41.

religion was. As compared with her half-sister, happily deceased, she was a very irreligious sort of woman; but perhaps it is nearest to the fact to say that she would most willingly have adopted a form something like her father, not materially differing in doctrine and in ritual from the Church of Rome, but altogether under English rule, and as a free Church of England, *sibi imperiosus, et in seipso totus teres atque rotundus*. But this could not be. However high she might hold her head as the daughter of her father, born in lawful wedlock, she knew that no Roman Catholic in or out of the kingdom could possibly admit it, and that a large number of Anglo-Catholics were at best doubtful.

At the present time, few historical students would be at the trouble to assert her legitimacy, either according to the law of the Church, the law of nature, or the law of the land; and then, though the great bulk of the people were quite willing to waive their theoretical objections in face of their very positive objections to an alien by blood, by birth, and by marriage, it was still desirable that she should lean on that party which held that, theoretically and practically, she was the true and only heir; so within a couple of months Parliament was assembled, and led off with four statutes which established her and the English sovereignty and independence. These were:—1. 'An Act restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same,' commonly known as the Act of Supremacy: the Act in which occurs the celebrated and enduring passage:

'No foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate, spiritual or temporal, shall at any time after the last day of this session of Parliament, use, enjoy or exercise any manner of power, jurisdiction, superiority, authority, pre-eminence or privilege, spiritual or ecclesiastical, within this realm';

the Act which, once for all, thrust aside the contention, still sometimes heard, that England, having been given to the Pope by King John, remains papal territory till the Pope surrenders it.

2. 'An Act for Uniformity of Common Prayer and Divine Service in the Church, and the Administration of the Sacraments,' commonly known as the Act of Uniformity, which established on its present basis the Church of England so as to include Anglo-Catholics and Puritans, the High Church and the Low. It is often forgotten that the modern form of the Church of England is a compromise from its very beginning,

and that the differences of opinion which now too often disturb our public harmony are not due to differences in the interpretation of the rubric but have existed before the rubric itself was carefully worded so as to be capable of these differences.

3. 'An Act of Recognition of the Queen's Highness' title 'to the imperial crown of this realm': a purely personal Act ordering that her Majesty 'is, and in very deed ought to be, 'our most rightful and lawful Sovereign Liege Lady and 'Queen'; and 4. An Act declaring it treason to endeavour to depose the Queen, or to preach and say that she is not and ought not to be Queen, nor ought to have the style, honour and kingly name: an Act which was brought into prominence a few years later by an express violation of it by the Pope and, inferentially, by the Pope's emissaries. After which the work of government might begin.

Irrespective of the dangerous slough into which Mary had plunged affairs religious and ecclesiastical, she had done no less for the temporal and political business of her people. In violation of her marriage contract, she had engaged the country in a war with France, without the pretence of a quarrel, and without taking even reasonable precautions to prepare for it, in men, stores, or money.

Unlike her father and her grandfather she had scattered money with a free hand, careless of expenditure if only she could win a smile or an amiable word from her truant husband. The very strict economy of Henry VII was thrown to the winds; the lavish expenditure of the early years of Henry VIII seemed parsimony in comparison; the depreciation in the value of money owing to the importation of the precious metals from America helped; and the expenditure of the Crown, which, towards the end of Henry's reign, had been about 50,000*l.* per annum, had risen in Mary's second year to 213,000*l.*, to 345,000*l.* in 1557, in her last year to 267,000*l.* for six months, or at the rate of 534,000*l.* for the year; and at her death she left a debt of nearly 250,000*l.*

This then was the state of things which greeted Elizabeth on her accession: a war with France; Calais lost; a war with Scotland; a claimant to the throne, supported by France, by Scotland, and believed in by a considerable number of her own subjects; an empty treasury; a heavy debt; a defeated army, an impoverished navy. A strong man might have felt the position difficult; Elizabeth faced it with alacrity and apparent cheerfulness. She met Philip's proposal to marry his deceased wife's sister with a refusal so happily arranged that he could still remain friendly and make her

interests his when the treaty of Cateau Cambrésis was negotiated. The naval and military operations which she was able to direct against the French interference in Scotland were brought to an end on the death of the Queen Regent in June, and the treaty of Edinburgh in July. The death of Francis II of France in December relieved her from all immediate pressure of French influence, and when Mary returned to Scotland the personal equation in the shape of Catherine's dislike of her daughter-in-law bettered Elizabeth's position enormously. But Mary's presence in Scotland was itself a threatening danger; only, as Professor Pollard has well pointed out, the problems of Scottish religion and Scottish politics were henceforth to be worked out by British forces. According to Professor Pollard:

'Theocratic Scotland and Erastian England had quarrels enough in store, but they were over domestic questions, and were decided without intervention from abroad. Henceforth Great Britain was to be the arena for none but battles of its own; no Spaniard in London nor Frenchman in Edinburgh was to dictate the issues of peace and war. The feud, which had long been fomented by alien irritants, slowly died; and gradually the Borders disappeared.'

All the same, danger might come to Elizabeth from Scotland, and still more from England; and Mary, refusing the conditions of the treaty of Edinburgh, might be expected to set it in motion. There can be little doubt that Mary was a source of danger, and was believed by Cecil to be so, to a greater extent than she probably was. At any rate it became, properly enough, his first care to prevent this, and, though Mr. Pollard does not seem to admit it, he made arrangements in Scotland, by friendly communications with the Lords of the Congregation, that Mary should have her hands full in her own country. It is perhaps not too much to suppose also that care was taken that France should not be in a position to give trouble; and if we consider that Philip, on his part, equally saw his interest in her disturbed state, the French Wars of Religion will be better understood. In describing Mary's unhappy marriage with Darnley there is scant room for any novelty, but Mr. Pollard's description of the bridegroom, though old in sense, is worth quoting for the admirable way in which it says much in small compass:

'Darnley can of all the Stuarts only be pronounced the worst. Physically handsome, he was intellectually imbecile; he was obstinate, quarrelsome, licentious, ill-bred, and weak. He treated

his royal bride with disgusting brutality and her nobles with insufferable insolence; he betrayed her trust and her honour as a woman and as a queen; and his own fate hardly did him injustice.'

Such a paragraph in itself, added to the fate that linked this creature to Mary, explains the foundation of all her future history—the murder of Riccio, the murder of Darnley, the marriage with Bothwell—Carberry Hill, Langside, Tutbury, Fotheringhay. Mr. Pollard, rightly we think, does not waste much of his limited space in discussing the question of the genuineness of the Casket Letters, or Mary's guilt or innocence of Darnley's murder. It is a point of supreme interest, but a clear, categorical answer is impossible. Probably the Casket Letters were a job lot, forgeries and true letters mixed together with a fiendish ingenuity; but their importance has, we may think, been greatly exaggerated.

'There is ample evidence,' says Mr. Pollard, 'that the thralldom of Darnley's yoke was proving intolerable to her haughty and impatient spirit. Public wrongs inflamed her private griefs. Darnley intrigued against her abroad as well as at home. . . . He schemed to secure the Scottish crown matrimonial, and to limit Mary's authority. He seemed bent on ruining her policy as well as destroying her happiness, and Mary was driven to desperation. . . . If she wished Darnley dead and let her wish be known, others did the same. It seemed monstrous that such a wretch should be permitted to trouble the peace of Scotland, and few of its lords were entire strangers to one or other of the schemes for his removal.'

There is no room to doubt the general complicity of the lords, though Mr. Pollard thinks that Moray kept somewhat aloof and 'looked through his fingers.' That Bothwell was the actual contriver of the details is practically certain.

'The vexed problem is the extent of Mary's complicity. . . . That Mary actively plotted her husband's assassination can only be proved by the disputed Casket Letters. That she wished for his death is indubitable; whether she desired the means is more doubtful, but it is probable that she let her wish be known to men who were prepared to adopt the means, and had grounds for expecting forgiveness and favour. Such conduct on Mary's part was a breach of morals rather than of the criminal law, and to men's moral sense it was less shocking that Mary should wish for the murder of such a husband than that she should marry his murderer. . . . Catholic Europe stood aghast at Mary's wild career. "With this last act, so dishonourable to God and herself" wrote the papal nuncio destined for Scotland, "the propriety of sending any sort of envoy ceases. . . . One cannot as a rule expect much from people who are slaves to their desires." For the moment Mary had lost

all her friends in Europe and roused all her foes in Scotland. To both alike the Bothwell marriage seemed a damning comment on the Darnley murder, and almost universal horror was expressed by those who did and those who did not feel it.'

About the rest there is no obscurity ; but when Mary came into England the real difficulty of Elizabeth's reign began, and for the next twenty years the trouble of home government circled round her. Cecil would probably have made short work of the problem, and would have handed the fugitive Queen back to her brother and her rebellious subjects, who might be expected to find a summary solution. That, Elizabeth would not allow, and out of the various alternatives chose the only one that seemed at all possible. The insurrection of the northern earls, of which Mary was the occasion, though but to a small extent the cause, marked the beginning of the trouble. Although a revolt ostensibly in the cause of religion, it was in reality, as Mr. Pollard has shown, largely a revolt against changing social and economic conditions ; and while in some respects it may be compared with the Pilgrimage of Grace, in others it may be described as a belated echo of the more celebrated *Affaire du Connétable de Bourbon*. The poorer people 'making the last armed protest in England against the secular 'spirit,' wearing 'on their coats the red cross of the crusaders,' on their banner 'the five wounds of Christ,' and demanding that 'the Catholic religion should be restored, the council 'purged of its new, and filled up with its old, noble members,' seems to be in the main a repetition of the former ; while the nobles demanding a restoration of feudal franchises, plotting with Alva for a Spanish invasion of the country, or scheming for a partition of England, and the extension of Mary's sovereignty to the Humber, even the marriage of Mary to the Duke of Norfolk ; all seem to have, though unconsciously, taken Bourbon as their exemplar.

The danger of the situation was apparently heightened by the fact that, careless of the northern trouble, or in defiance of it, perhaps realising that it was, in a measure, drawing Alva's teeth, Elizabeth at this very time took the opportunity of seizing a quantity of treasure—estimated at 150,000*l.*, money of that date—on its way from Genoa to the Netherlands to pay the Spanish troops. The incident is familiarly known, as well as its unlooked-for effect in reviving the revolt in the Netherlands by causing Alva to impose the tax of the 'tenth penny.' What is not so familiarly known, but which, presumably, Cecil quite well understood, is that by this stop of

the sinews of war it was put out of Alva's power to retaliate, even if he wanted to do so. Cecil was not the man to take needless risks, and though he might think that Spain was not likely to make any move in the interests of either Mary or the northern earls, it was always well to be sure.

Mr. Pollard has well told how the conspiracy and rebellion ripened and broke out, to be crushed and punished with a severity which public opinion still considered as the fitting meed for an attempt to kindle civil war. How its later developments showed themselves the following year in the revolt of Lord Dacre, and in the year after in the Ridolfi plot and in the attempt which led to the execution of the Duke of Norfolk, is part of the current narrative. During the same period the relations between England and Spain were becoming more and more unfriendly, and though neither side was prepared to enter on war, Catherine conceived that she might possibly use the feeling to release herself from the irksome control of the Guises.

Hence the negotiations for the marriage of Elizabeth with the Duke of Anjou, but little more than half her age: negotiations which were exceedingly distasteful to the young Frenchman, who fancied neither an elderly wife nor an enforced residence in the land of fogs. Elizabeth, on her part, was willing to indulge in negotiations which would keep France aloof from Spain, and with the greater gusto, as she knew herself not likely to be inveigled into the marriage, which would certainly be hateful to her subjects. Mr. Pollard explains her conduct with regard to Anjou, as afterwards to his younger brother, and to many other suitors real or suggested, by the statement that marriage was impossible to her, as 'a physical defect precluded her from hopes of issue.' This, likely enough, is in itself not improbable, and may be the explanation of much that has appeared very questionable in her conduct, which undoubtedly gave occasion to scandal.

'Possibly,' says Mr. Pollard, 'there was a physical cause for Elizabeth's masculine mind and temper, and for the curious fact that no man lost his head over her as many did over Mary Queen of Scots. To judge from portraits, Elizabeth was as handsome as her rival, but she had no feminine fascination. . . . The impossibility of marriage made her all the freer with her flirtations, and she carried some of them to lengths which scandalised a public unconscious of Elizabeth's security. She had every reason to keep the public as well as courts and councils in the dark, and to convince the world that she could and would marry if the provocation were sufficient. To her and to her people, a husband would be a mere encumbrance

without children; but for others her hand held a crown, and it was a diplomatic asset which she could not afford to neglect out of modest scruples.'

Whether this was so or not, it is at least certain that the negotiations with France did not lead to the goal of Catherine's wishes—an armed alliance; and as she was determined not to enter on a war with Spain singlehanded, as the destruction of the Turkish fleet in the Gulf of Lepanto had done away with all hope of assistance from it, and the influence of Coligny over the King, her son, was increasing daily, rendering armed intervention in the Netherlands more probable, what had only been personally most distasteful to her seemed to become the source of extreme danger to France and to her own power, and she determined to have the cause removed.

To a sixteenth-century Italian the idea of assassination came more readily than even to a Scotchman or a Frenchman, and the murder of Coligny was resolved on. How the failure of that attempt led to another on a larger scale, and so, undesignedly, almost by accident, to a wholesale massacre is beyond the scope of Mr. Pollard's pages and is but briefly told. There was plenty of evidence that a general slaughter of Huguenots had often been spoken of, without, perhaps, any intention of committing it; but when it came, these speeches, cries, and sermons denouncing the protestants as lepers, were remembered and quoted to show that the massacre was a preconcerted affair—arranged even ten years beforehand. Such charges carry their own refutation.

The position, however, was one of extreme difficulty. Intended or not, the moral guilt of the massacre was certainly Catherine's, and though it may easily be believed that of that she was careless, she could not be so of the political complications which called for much diplomatic misrepresentation. At Rome it was hailed as a signal stroke for the maintenance of the true religion, and was honoured with a *Te Deum*. At Madrid it was shown to be the prevention of an endeavour to send armed support to the Netherlands. In Poland, where the display of Catholic bigotry would be fatal to the election of Henry of Anjou, and to the protestant German princes whose alliance was sorely needed, the massacre was merely the execution of justice on the most dangerous of traitors. In England again it was different.

'National indignation was intense, and to seek some means of gratifying the resentment would have been natural, popular and just. But it would not have been statesmanship. "Confess, sire,"

said the French ambassador at Madrid to Philip, "that it is to the king my master that you owe your Netherlands," and perhaps the Massacre of St. Bartholomew cost France the frontier of the Rhine. Catherine admitted that France had burnt her boats and was embarked on Philip's voyage, and it was her political folly and not her Catholic zeal that evoked his solitary laugh. The duty of English statesmen was to disappoint his expectations; to reconstruct, if possible, the policy which Philip thought the massacre had killed, and to curb their passion for revenge.'

Mary did indeed narrowly escape being sacrificed to this. She was a Guise, and the Guises were deeply implicated in the butchery. 'Negotiations were begun in September for her surrender to the Regent Mar, on the understanding that she was to be brought to justice by the Scots, and that England was to safeguard them against the consequences.' Fortunately for her, Mar died on October 28. Elizabeth had all along been opposed to the measure, and before Morton was established as regent the English people had agreed to consider the massacre in the light that Catherine's agent represented.

But it left its mark on the people, already highly indignant at the pope's having had the presumption to declare the Queen deposed and all who dared to obey her excommunicated. The sentence of excommunication sat but lightly on them; but the deposition was in the judgement of everybody, except the Queen herself, extremely dangerous.

To personal fear Elizabeth was a stranger; but Cecil, Walsingham and all others who in their own and public opinion were responsible for her safety were very uneasy. Hence the act, previously passed against those who spoke against the title of the Queen, was extended to the avowed subjects of that power which had very explicitly spoken against the Queen's title. Macaulay's argument against the justice and even common sense of this enactment is well known; but written at a date (1832) when the Catholics had just been emancipated, when every liberal politician was eager to make amends for two centuries of repression and to show their former foes in the best light, he has mis-stated the case. What he says is:

'To punish a man because we infer from the nature of some doctrine which he holds, or from the conduct of other persons who hold the same doctrines with him, that he will commit a crime, is persecution, and is, in every case, foolish and wicked. . . . To argue that, because a man is a Catholic, he must think it right to murder a heretical sovereign, and that because he thinks it right he will attempt to do it, and then, to found on this conclusion a law for punishing him as if he had done it, is plain persecution.'

But neither the Acts (13 Eliz. cap. i. ; 27 Eliz. cap. ii.) nor the ministers who, with the approval of the nation, enforced them, did so argue. They took their stand on the positive order of the sovereign whom all Catholics were bound to obey, an order too enforced by the threat of dire punishment. The words and their meaning, as recognised by the laity, cannot be too closely considered.

‘*Praecipimus et interdicimus universis et singulis proceribus, subditis, populis et aliis praedictis, ne illi ejusve monitis, mandatis et legibus audeant obedire. Qui secus egerint, eos simili anathematis sententia innodamus . . .*’

It is now frequently said that *anathema* may have, and in this sense has, a purely theological meaning, and is not rightly interpreted as a curse ; but the point on which we would lay stress is not what the theological mind now thinks it means, but what the lay mind then thought ; and when we remember that in the end of the sixteenth as in the beginning of the seventeenth century religious zeal often proved itself a very efficient assistance to political or personal hatred, and largely assisted or was believed to have assisted in the removal of the Regent Murray, William the Silent, Coligny and all who perished with him ; as also at a later date, of Henry III and Henry IV, we conceive that Macaulay’s argument is not pertinent, and that, however much we may deplore the result, however much we may regret any particular concrete example, the death of the so-called Catholic martyrs was as just as it certainly was legal. There can, we conceive, be no doubt that the celebrated bull ‘*Regnans in excelsis*’ was as directly the cause of the death of Campion and the other blessed martyrs as it was of the many named and nameless lay conspirators and of Mary herself.

For years before her execution the nation had been clamouring for her death. They had realised that she was the real danger, and on her death felt as Elizabeth had done on the death of her Tudor namesake. It is interesting to note how immediately the air cleared. There were no more conspiracies. The danger was from abroad, and the country was practically united to meet it. It could now devote itself whole-heartedly to the war with Spain, which, languishing on the part of Philip as long as Mary was living, took real form as soon as the object was to push the Infanta’s claim to the throne. For years the invasion of England and the great Armada had been talked of ; its concrete existence began with the news of Mary’s death, and it would probably have sailed in the summer of 1587, had it not been delayed by the death of Santa Cruz and by Drake’s

brilliant raid. It came the following year, with the result that all the world knows.

Of the further progress of the war—the counter-expedition to Lisbon in 1589, the sack of Cadiz in 1596, the numerous voyages of adventure and plunder—it is unnecessary to speak. It suited Elizabeth's finance to wage the war 'on the cheap.' She had no wish to worry her Parliament for money, and Parliament was well contented to hear of Spanish ports raided, Spanish vessels destroyed, Spanish treasure seized, without being called on to pay for it. It was not the best conceivable way of conducting a war, but it was not ineffective, and was slowly bleeding the Spanish Government to death, when a change of sovereigns, fortunate from their point of view, put them in a totally different position, and enabled them to make a not altogether unsatisfactory peace.

Beyond that, the internal government and condition of the country would call for scant notice, were it not for the growing strength of the House of Commons, which, apparently, was waiting but for the death of the Queen to assert itself. Elizabeth was quick to read the signs of the times; and proud as she was, her later speeches to Parliament are in interesting contrast with those of her successor. To this, epigram might have lent itself, as it did to the Spanish war:

Tandis qu'Elisabeth fût roi,
L'Anglais fût d'Espagne l'effroi;
Maintenant, devise et caquette,
Régi par la reine Jaquette.

which, in its English equivalent, runs:

When glorious Bess was England's king,
Her name to Spain did terror bring;
But idle cackle has no weight,
Now that Queen Jamie rules the State.

ART. XI.—THE POLITICAL PREDICAMENT.

1. *Speech of the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour, M.P., at Nottingham.* November 17, 1910.
2. *Speech of the Prime Minister at Hull.* November 25, 1910.
3. *Speech of the Marquis of Lansdowne at Glasgow.* November 25, 1910.
4. *Speech of the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour, M.P., at the Albert Hall.* November 29, 1910.

IN another fortnight the first Parliament of King George V will assemble at Westminster. It will meet under conditions of even greater importance than must necessarily always belong to the first gathering of the Estates of the Realm under a new monarch. In our constitutional system Parliament (King, Lords, and Commons) is and has always been absolute sovereign, supreme over the Executive Government and over legislation. No written Constitution has ever limited its power or its functions. Parliament can constitutionally alter the succession to the throne, can reform or reconstruct either House of Parliament, can determine what authority is to belong to its own component parts. No court of law or extraneous power can question the constitutionality of an Act of Parliament—its claim to the obedience of British subjects; for Parliament is recognised as the embodiment of the nation itself, to dispute whose supremacy is rebellion.

It is natural therefore that British citizens should watch with some anxiety the conduct and demeanour of the new Parliament, its sense of responsibility for the exercise of the mighty prerogatives and uncontrolled power that belong to it. They know well that in this country power and responsibility go hand in hand; that if the Constitution is to work, neither King nor House of Lords nor House of Commons can act with sole regard to the wish, the whim, or the passion of the moment. In modern times the main security for the responsible action of our public men has been its publicity. The advisers of the King are known men; so are the Peers; so are members of Parliament. They cannot veil their political action under a secret ballot. In public they have to give account, and do give account, of their own conduct. And they are judged accordingly. When things go well, or when things go ill, the public knows, or at least thinks it knows, on whom to bestow praise, or on whose shoulders to place the blame.

The elections are over. In the serious task that lies before Parliament, the country, it need scarcely be said, looks to leading statesmen on both sides of politics for a more prudent and responsible treatment of great constitutional questions than was apparent in the partisan electioneering harangues with which from the platform or the press the country was deluged during the month before Christmas. It is useless to deplore the developments which in recent years the methods of political controversy have undergone. Even Ministers high in service of the Crown are not ashamed to drop for a time the character of statesmen and to vie with the spouters of Hyde Park and Trafalgar Square in abundance of ill-conditioned clap-trap and in language of violent denunciation. Whilst at least the present and the ex-Prime Minister remain the leaders of the two great parties, there is no fear that the honourable traditions, the dignity, and the courtesy that have hitherto marked political controversy will be entirely lost sight of ; but even with regard to Mr. Asquith and Mr. Balfour, though the amenities of discussion are not forgotten, the great national debate suffers not a little in character from the supposed necessity throughout the course of a General Election of a daily speech or 'manifesto' or public letter from either leader, each striving to score some electioneering point against the other, whilst both, it would seem, are studiously anxious to avoid any complete disclosure of the political ends they really have in view. What to-day Mr. Asquith means by 'Home Rule' is as much a mystery to the public as what to-day Mr. Balfour means by 'Tariff Reform' or the 'Referendum.' From the merely electioneering standpoint both, in adhering to these tactics, are doubtless wise. 'Home Rule' and 'Tariff Reform' may be good cries so long as they are not explained in specific measures for dissolving the national unity or imposing taxation on our bread-and-butter. The cries please the respective caucuses ; and yet they have brought division and disaster to the parties that have adopted them. For after all, and in the long run, a party wins the enduring confidence of the public by the fact that its policy is a practical one, suited to the conditions of the time. If in the past twenty years Liberals can boast of any good work done, it has had no connexion whatever with the policy of Home Rule. If, as we hope, in the coming years Unionists accomplish great things for the country, it will have little connexion with the policy of Protection.

Political discussion will now be transferred from the platform to the floor of the House of Commons, where statesmen will meet each other face to face, where they will be forced to

listen to and answer each other's arguments, and where they will be expected to take account of the consequences which may be expected to follow immediately or ultimately upon the action that is taken. We shall be greatly surprised if, in the critical situation that has been now greatly reached, public men do not show to far greater advantage in Parliament than when addressing party gatherings of their own supporters with the object principally of pouring scorn upon their political opponents. During a General Election the immediate object of electioneers, and at such a time all are electioneers, is, of course, party victory. The interests that are greater than those of party are temporarily lost to view. So it has always been, and the British public quite understands and discounts the exaggerations and excesses of the party platform. It is tolerant, perhaps too tolerant, of foolish, ill-conditioned, violent language. What is said is one thing, but what is done is a very different matter. Whilst speeches are forgotten, the effect of blunders remains. For political misdeeds, for mistakes in action, statesmen will be held strictly to account. Let us remember, however, that since 1831 the Liberal party has always been accused of revolutionary intentions, and for much of the time that has since elapsed that party has been in power. Nevertheless, the Statute-book—that record of the work done—has shown little of the spirit of revolution. Is all this to be changed? It seems certain that further steps in conformity with the growth of modern democratic sentiment will be taken. With this it is well that men should lay their account. But we see no reason to believe that the British people will now any more than in former times tolerate anything in the nature of 'revolution,' of 'confiscation,' of 'socialism,' in the sense in which those words are ordinarily understood; or will be willing to make, in reforming their constitutional arrangements, a complete breach with the past.

The Prime Minister's action in dissolving a Parliament some ten months old, in which he was supported by a huge and unbroken majority of the House of Commons, and in which he had received no check from the House of Lords, was an entirely novel proceeding. True, his majority was not a homogeneous one, and depended on the cordial alliance of three groups; but nothing had as yet happened seriously to disturb their harmony, and there seemed to be almost no prospect of a purely Liberal majority being returned which would render him independent of the Nationalist and Labour parties. A dissolution was declared to be necessary because the private 'Conference' of Liberal and Conservative leaders over the

'constitutional question' had failed to arrive at an agreement as to the solution that they would recommend to Parliament. So urgent, indeed, was the necessity for immediate dissolution declared to be, that it was impossible to postpone it for a few days to enable the new electoral register to come into operation. Hence the virtual disfranchisement of tens of thousands of electors. From the large number of sittings of the 'Conference' it was argued, probably correctly, that for a long time the Radical and Conservative leaders hoped that agreement was possible. What were the views of the statesmen conferring, the public has not been told. About what points it appeared that agreement was possible, or not possible, we have no information. Indeed, we have not even been told that amongst themselves agreement *was* impossible; but merely (what is a very different thing) that they had not discovered a solution which would meet with complete party approval. Hence they adjourned, apparently on excellent terms with each other, *sine die*, and a brand-new Parliament, which had done nothing either good or evil, was at once sent about its business!

The 'Conference' sprang out of the best of motives, and though it failed as regards its immediate object, it is very probable that indirectly good results may yet follow from the friendly interchange of views between opposing and rival statesmen. The death of King Edward and the accession of a new king had made all men last summer desire (if it were possible) to avoid, or to postpone, a great constitutional party struggle. A way of doing this was provided by the 'Conference,' whose negotiations for a time compelled the most militant politicians to rest on their arms. In this way a welcome period of comparative peace was obtained. But it soon appeared that people were expecting from the 'Conference' a great deal more than it was possible for it to achieve. It resembled in no respect those gatherings of the representatives of different States who have met together to frame in private, and then submit for the approval of those States, a plan for uniting them. That the Conference would really hit upon some plan which would please everybody, which would propose vast changes, and pass both Houses of Parliament with universal applause was highly improbable; but the hope nevertheless was indulged in. It is not in that way that amongst us previous reforms have been carried. *After* they have been threshed out in Parliament; *after* public debate has made people understand the principal points in controversy; *after* irreconcilable differences appear to threaten positive deadlock, then, indeed, in the past has often come the time for compromise, when responsible and cool-headed

men have been able to assert themselves and to enable the country to win its way in safety through a period of trial and danger. We shall hear more of 'Conferences' before the pending constitutional struggle is at an end; but they will come after, not before exhaustive parliamentary debate.

Mr. Asquith's addresses and speeches gave no adequate reason for the late dissolution. The Parliament of 1910 had been elected, we presume, to fulfil some purpose; to debate the measures, of greater and less importance, which Ministers might lay before it. The House of Commons passed the Budget, it is true, of the previous year; so did the House of Lords; but the Budget of the current year was suspended by the House of Commons. Indeed, under present Exchequer management it will soon be deemed of no importance whatever at what time Parliament makes provision for the service of the year! Next session there will necessarily be two Budgets for the House of Commons to discuss, in the intervals not occupied with voting the estimates and reconstructing the Constitution. The Prime Minister dissolved Parliament, not because any parliamentary difficulty had occurred; but because he thought it opportune with a view to the carrying into effect of the policy of himself and his colleagues. It was a remarkable step, one hardly in accordance with customary practice, but whether a wise and proper one it is now hardly worth while to discuss. The King having accepted the advice of the Prime Minister to dissolve, a situation in some respects new was created, and with that situation the British people had and has to deal as best it may.

A year ago, though, as invariably happens at a General Election, there were various questions about which men differed, the predominating issues to be determined by the appeal to the people stood out pretty clearly. Parliament was then dissolved because the House of Lords refused to allow the Budget of the year, which had passed the House of Commons, to become an Act of Parliament. The Government was bound under these circumstances to take one of three courses—viz. (1) to resign, throwing upon the Opposition the duty of providing the supplies for the year; (2) to submit the means of raising the supplies, contrary to every constitutional practice, to the House of Lords; (3) to dissolve. In our opinion there was something to be said for the first course; though naturally it would have been very unpopular with the majority. Still, when a parliamentary Opposition refuses the supplies of the year, the responsibility for raising them in a better way should be placed on its own shoulders. The second course would have made the House

of Lords, through its annual control over the Budget, supreme over the Executive Government—the Ministers of the King—though it enjoyed the full confidence of the House of Commons; thus not merely upsetting every constitutional doctrine, but giving rise to a state of affairs, in fact, in which parliamentary government, in the British conception of it, would hardly be possible. The third course, of dissolution, adopted by Mr. Asquith, was that which would probably have been taken in the circumstances by any Prime Minister.

Thus in January 1910 the dispute between the Houses of Parliament as to the control of national finance brought about the dissolution. It was this dispute which very largely destroyed the effect on the minds of the electorate of the weighty criticisms directed against several portions of Mr. Lloyd George's Budget. Whether these provisions were equitable or wise was lost sight of in the keenness of the controversy between the 'rights of the representatives of the people' and the 'privileges of the Peers.' And this was not the only thing that hampered the efforts of many friends of the Unionist cause. The foolish nostrums of the Tariff Reformers were allowed by the leaders of the Conservatives, though many of the latter had probably little faith in them, to be put forward as the party alternative to Mr. Lloyd George's finance. Thus it happened, owing maybe to the fact that the hotheads had for the time being got the ascendancy over the long heads in the counsels of the Conservative party, that the Opposition had become, perhaps unjustly, but certainly not unnaturally, a party closely identified with protection and privilege. Now protection and privilege, though they have many and powerful friends, are always likely to find themselves out-voted when the British democracy—so largely industrial—goes to the poll. Though a year ago the result was less disastrous to the Unionists than in 1906 when the first effects of fiscal dissension in that party were fully realised, Liberals returned to power with an immense majority. There were moderate men on both sides who hoped that the new House of Commons would show itself capable of tackling in a practical fashion some of the difficult problems awaiting solution. Their hopes were destroyed by the dissolution; and to a new Parliament, elected under different conditions, but whilst the popular feelings of ten months earlier still largely prevailed, the immediate future belongs.

In the late Parliament the House of Lords, and not the House of Commons, did make a praiseworthy and serious attempt to face the difficulties of reconstructing a Second Chamber. Many years ago Lord Rosebery used to urge that reform, which even then had long been desirable, must necessarily soon become

imperative. The mere change that was being produced in the House of Lords by the rapid increase of its numbers would of itself soon compel reform. The Government proposals, however, did not contemplate reforming the constitution of the Second Chamber; or in any way bringing it up to date. Their plan was greatly to diminish its powers, and apparently to do what was still more objectionable, to destroy the independence of any Second Chamber altogether. The so-called safeguards ensuring to the House of Lords the power to delay legislation were themselves to be at the mercy of the House of Commons. Were the Government proposals accepted by Parliament, the House of Commons might, so far as we can see, give to itself power to legislate by mere resolution. There would be thus no limit to the omnipotence of a party majority of the House of Commons except what might be exercised by its own conscience, usually in the keeping of the party caucus. The 'Parliament Bill' introduced by the Government in the House of Commons was not proceeded with there; and though the resolutions upon which it was founded were discussed, there was no general debating amongst the representatives of the people of the position of the House of Lords or of the Peers, or of possible reforms of the Second Chamber.

Accordingly, when last month the dissolution took place the attitude of the two great parties on the constitutional question had become roughly defined. There was no dispute now as to extending the authority of the House of Lords over finance. The question had become a more general one. The Opposition held that the true policy was to reform, not to abolish the Second Chamber as an independent factor in legislation. The Government proposed, not in name but in fact, to reduce the power of the House of Lords to such an extent that to all intents and purposes the full sovereignty hitherto belonging to Parliament would henceforth attach to the majority of the House of Commons. It is hardly going beyond the truth to say that the Government were endeavouring to establish a Single Chamber parliamentary system.

So far it would certainly seem that Lord Rosebery, Lord Lansdowne, and Mr. Balfour had approached the serious crisis that had arisen in a spirit much more consonant with British statesmanship than that shown by their opponents. Both branches of the Legislature are, in truth, greatly in need of reform. The manner in which the House of Lords is constituted unfits it from adequately fulfilling at the present day the functions of a Second Chamber. But the House of Commons, it must be

remembered, is also very far from faultless. In many respects in recent years it has not adequately performed the functions belonging to a First Chamber. It has not shown itself truly representative. It has been willing to derogate from the position of a truly national assembly for the free debating and deciding of political issues, and to accept the humbler one of a mere machine for registering votes. Our whole parliamentary system and our parliamentary methods require overhauling. The serious task lies before our statesmen of setting both our Houses in order—a heavy one, no doubt, but not one which should baffle the wisdom of Parliament or the practical good sense of the British people.

Before discussing what is called the constitutional question,—the relations between the two branches of the Legislature, and their composition—another very important difference between the appeals to the people in January and December of 1909 and 1910 should be noticed. Had the House of Lords and the Opposition triumphed in January, their victory would have been immediately followed by the introduction of a Tariff Reform or Protectionist Budget. The language of the Tariff Reformers made this quite clear. In December, however, Free Trade stood in a far stronger position than a year before. In Europe and America the public had begun to cry out against high prices, and against that legislation which made prices, and was intended to make them, artificially high. In Canada, as is perfectly well known to everyone who has inquired into the subject, the agricultural progress of the West is grievously handicapped by fiscal regulations framed for the purpose of increasing the profits of manufacturers in the East. 'Taxation for revenue only' had now become a popular cry over vast regions of the great Dominion; and the Prime Minister of Canada had himself held up as an ideal, though it might be impossible for Canadians at the present time to accept it as an example, the fiscal system of the Mother Country. The progress of fiscal questions in the United States in recent years we have discussed very fully in this Review (in October 1908 and in the present number), and we need say no more here of the disclosures of the corruption and the jobbery that have there belonged to the construction of a 'scientific tariff.' These things have been making a steady impression in England. Hence in speeches of Conservatives the urgency of Tariff Reform was less frequently insisted upon; and unmistakeably it was beginning to hold a less forward place amongst the appeals made by the Opposition to the electorate. Many Unionist Free Traders believed (in our

opinion prematurely) that Tariff Reform was practically already dead; and that though some day an incoming Unionist Government would have to do something in that direction to 'save its face,' there was now little reason to fear, beyond some almost nominal changes in the existing system, the abandonment of that Free Trade upon which our commercial and fiscal arrangements have so long rested.

Whilst, however, fiscal questions were less prominent at the last than at the preceding General Election, Home Rule had come again to the fore. In the eyes of Mr. Redmond and the Irish Nationalists Mr. Asquith's policy of withdrawing power from the House of Lords is a mere step towards the accomplishment of the designs of the late Mr. Parnell. Pass the 'Parliament Bill,' and it will be a simple matter, in his opinion, 'to rush' a Home Rule measure through Parliament, without the least regard to the wishes of the 'predominant partner,' to general public opinion, or to the vehement protests of millions of the best and most prosperous part of the Irish community.

We have never been amongst those who believed that the choice of the nation lay between accepting Home Rule and accepting Protection. The adoption of the latter cause by so many Unionists has undoubtedly greatly weakened the defence of the Union. This danger, always present to the mind of Lord Hartington—viz. that the maintenance of the Union might become associated with some retrograde or unpopular policy—has come upon us. But even now it would be unwise merely to weigh in the balance the evils which Unionists believe would follow Home Rule against the evils that Free Traders believe would follow Protection. Practical men have to consider not merely the dangers that will follow the adoption of a particular policy, but how far its adoption is actually impending. At the General Election in January 1910, Protection, should the Conservatives have won, would have been imminent. In December 1910 this was hardly so; whilst a victory for Mr. Asquith would undoubtedly mean that the Home Rule policy would once more threaten the nationality of the United Kingdom. That is the position of affairs at the present time. Whatever may be the differences, fiscal or otherwise, amongst Unionists, it is impossible for them to blink the fact that the great cause for which they have so long and successfully contended is once more at stake, and that the 'Parliament Bill' is regarded and advocated as the stepping-stone to Home Rule. Protection may in itself be a greater or lesser evil than Home Rule. Either would lead, in the belief of its opponents, to consequences most injurious to the nation, involving in all probability civil

dissension and strife. But for reasons already given, and for others which will be noticed further on, Protection has become the remoter danger of the two; and all who care about the national unity of the kingdom should rally in its defence against the immediate attack which is to be made upon it.

We are once more approaching a time when Home Rulers will have to give a definite meaning to the words 'Home Rule.' It cannot mean less than the establishing of national parliamentary government in Ireland, with an Executive chosen by and dependent on an Irish Parliament. It does not mean Provincial Government, State Government, or Local Government. The basis of the demand made by Mr. Parnell (and we are not aware that there is any difference between Redmondite and Parnellite Home Rule) is that the dwellers in Ireland must become 'a nation' in the political sense of the word. English Home Rulers, or at all events a large number of them, do not mean this at all. They do not, however, venture to say that they themselves differ *in toto* as to the end at which Irish Nationalists are aiming; but they indulge the dream that whilst they are professing to give 'nationhood,' they can yet keep tied the 'nation's' hands. They would deny to an Irish Parliament and Government those powers which British subjects have hitherto considered not only essential to the parliamentary system at home; but which they have freely granted to every self-governing colony of the Empire. Imagine limiting the powers of the Parliaments of the great Dominion of Canada, and of the great Commonwealth of Australia, so that it should be beyond the scope of their authority to deal with local military forces and constabulary, with religious establishments, or with the imposition of customs! But Nationalists claim that Ireland is to be more than a colony. It is to be a nation.

It is now a quarter of a century since the 'Hawarden Kite' announced to an astonished world the conversion of Mr. Gladstone to Home Rule. During that not very short interval the official leaders of the Liberal party have three several times thrown their aspirations and intentions with regard to 'amending the provision for the government of Ireland' into the prosaic form of an Act of Parliament. There was the Bill of 1886, an incident of which was the expulsion of Irishmen from taking part in the Imperial (we should prefer to call them the national) affairs of the United Kingdom. There was the Bill of 1893, an interesting feature of which was the retention of Irish members at Westminster to control the government of Great Britain, whilst British members of Parliament were to be entirely excluded from any voice in the government of Ireland. There

was the curious measure introduced by Mr. Birrell four years ago. To three stranger measures no British political party ever gave birth.

What was their fate? The Separation Bill was summarily rejected by the House of Commons and the country. Bill number 2, after having been torn to shreds by discussion in the House of Commons, was thrust through that House by closure and guillotine, and was rejected by the Lords, whose action was afterwards heartily approved by the country. The last Bill (in 1907)—a little legislative abortion—perished soon after birth; since the Irish Nationalists, to please whom it had been introduced, refused to look at it. The Prime Minister has told us at an election meeting in Scotland that the Government intend to bring forward another Home Rule Bill. Previous experience does not incline us to think that either the country or the Liberal party is likely to gain much by the making of a new attempt to combine opposing ideals in a Statute reconstructing the relations of Great Britain and Ireland. Nevertheless something is always gained when necessity compels the translation of sounding phrases, diversely interpreted, into plain English intended to find a place in the Statute-book. It is rumoured that Mr. Asquith is about to attempt even a wilder scheme of Constitution building than any of those to which we have referred, and that 'Home Rule all round' is to be embodied in the next constructive effort of Liberal statesmanship. This it is difficult to believe; and we shall await the official translation into clear language of that specious phrase before we waste the time of our readers in seriously considering the singular Constitution which the words appear to promise to the citizens of what is at present a United Kingdom.

After the last failure of the Liberal Government to obtain Irish Nationalist support for its Irish Bill, the right and wise course for the Prime Minister to have adopted was clear. He and his colleagues had done their best; but they were told this was not the sort of thing the Nationalists wanted. He should then have placed on the shoulders of Mr. Redmond and his friends the burden and responsibility of bringing forward for themselves their own scheme of Home Rule. It must be remembered that a very large proportion of the Nationalist members are men not only of great ability, but also of exceptionally long parliamentary experience. They claim to be the only exponents of the wishes of the Irish 'nation.' Well, then, let them say exactly what it is they want; and not only say it in speeches, but throw the desires of the Irish parliamentary party into the form of a Bill, and lay

it on the table of the House of Commons. Many English Home Rulers are continually urging that Mr. Redmond asks for nothing that is not perfectly constitutional and free from danger to the kingdom as a whole. It is difficult to see how this could have been said of Mr. Parnell, whose policy it was to play Liberals and Conservatives against each other, allying himself sometimes with the one and sometimes with the other, in order to gain his own ends; but never admitting any limitations to the claim of Irish national independence, and never imitating the example of Mr. Butt in producing a Home Rule measure of his own. As things now stand, British statesmen might well leave to the Irish parliamentary party the responsibility for taking the next step in the direction of Irish Home Rule.

It is greatly to be desired that in the coming constitutional discussions a sufficiently broad and comprehensive view should be taken of what the country really needs. The questions to be solved are difficult, but ought not to be insuperable to British statesmanship; which, if it is only bold enough to declare itself with sufficient explicitness, will find itself well backed by British common sense. We are about to be engaged in something more than a wrangle for party victory, and the results of our present controversies are certain to have permanent effect on the future of the country. No one is really taken in by the nonsense talked on Radical platforms about the struggle between the Peers on the one side and the People on the other. If that were really the state of the case there would be no controversy at all! It is the essence of the question that in the attitude now taken up by the Peers a very large proportion of the people concur. Thanks to the guidance of the Unionist leaders the Peers now stand for a *reformed* Second Chamber as an essential branch of the British Legislature; and in order to achieve that end the Peers have shown themselves ready to abandon powers and privileges that have always belonged to them, even that hereditary principle on which the constitution of the House of Lords has always been based. We are loth to believe that the Liberal party will permanently range itself against the policy of reforming the House of Lords in accordance with modern ideas, in order that it may force upon the country the virtual sovereignty of a Single Chamber. For we must remind our readers that the so-called 'Parliament Bill,' if it does not in terms annihilate the authority of one branch of the Legislature, puts it into the power of the House of Commons to invest itself with any powers that it pleases. Lord Lansdowne, at Glasgow, rightly declared

that what was wanted was 'a real Second Chamber, not 'a sham Second Chamber.' That we believe to be the enormously preponderating view of all those who have given any sort of consideration to constitutional questions. The Liberal leaders will be ill-advised indeed if they set that opinion at defiance.

There is, we believe, much more fundamental agreement as to the direction constitutional reforms should take than the exigencies of party rivalry, party speaking, and party writing suffer to appear. There is now a concurrence of opinion that in these democratic days it is impossible to base a Second Chamber on the hereditary principle. It strikes the modern man as irrational to the last degree to reward a British citizen for services (more often rendered to a party organisation than to the nation) by giving to him and to his heirs for ever the privilege of making laws for the British people. On the other hand it is impossible to deny the fact that the House of Lords does contain a considerable number of members admirably fitted to render valuable service to the people as legislators, and in debating the great affairs of the nation. It was with these things in view that Lord Rosebery and Lord Lansdowne and the Peers brought before the public their outline of a scheme of reform. The matters, which seem to us to lie at the very root of the real question before the country, never came before the late House of Commons at all! Its life was cut short before it had been allowed to consider them. Unfortunately so; for it would have been far better that many of the points dealt with in debate in the House of Lords should also have been subjected to discussion in the House of Commons before the matter was relegated to the electorate.

On another subject there is now complete agreement. Finance must remain under the sole authority of the House of Commons. The British elector now, as always, is absolutely determined to be taxed only by the man he elects, and whom, when the time comes, he can dismiss. But this old and fundamental principle of the Constitution is not to be made a cover, by 'tacking' or otherwise, for divesting a Second Chamber of its authority over ordinary legislation. In this matter also the Unionist leaders are now in full accord with the general sentiment.

The old belief of Englishmen all over the world in the advantages belonging to a two-chamber Parliament has not been weakened by what they have seen at Westminster during the last few years. It does not suit party leaders, and it is naturally distasteful to members of Parliament, to call attention

to the shortcomings of the House of Commons. Nevertheless there is amongst the general public profound dissatisfaction with the unreality of the debates, the lack of independent judgment amongst members, the mechanical voting undiscussed of large portions of Bills. Each party in turn has free recourse to the instrumentality of closure and guillotine. The leader of the House, whether Liberal or Conservative, deplors the melancholy necessity. The leader of the Opposition vehemently protests against the iniquity. Then the guillotine descends; and the degrading spectacle is seen of members trooping round the lobbies for hours together, giving the sanction of the House of Commons without discussion to what the representatives of the people were sent there to debate, and about which great differences of opinion exist within the House itself. This is a matter that greatly concerns the general respect in which the House of Commons is held; and only the House of Commons itself can find a remedy. Assuredly there never was a time when the thinking portion of the British public were less willing to entrust the full powers of Parliament to the House of Commons alone.

In addition to this dissatisfaction with House of Commons procedure, there is a general and well-justified feeling amongst the public that the House is not as truly representative as it ought to be of the political opinions of the electorate. It is not necessary to aim at absolute numerical equality between the electorates in different constituencies; but, as matters stand, a system which gives the same representation to Kilkenny with 1700 electors as it gives to the Romford division of Essex with nearly 53,000, is glaringly out of accord with public sentiment. Again, it is felt in Great Britain to be unjust that Ireland should have a much larger proportionate representation in the House of Commons than England and Scotland. When, owing to the great growth in the population and prosperity of Scotland which followed its union with England, the forty-five representatives allotted to Scotland by the great statute of 1707 were ultimately found to be too few to give Scotland its proportionate weight in the actually existing conditions, new arrangements were made. By the various Reform Acts the number of Scottish members is now fixed at seventy-two. The change was rightly and wisely made, though of course the balance of voting strength was altered, as against England, from what was established at the time of the Union.

In another direction the conviction has been slowly gaining ground that some means must be found to represent the variety

of opinion that exists amongst electors. Much, for example, may doubtless be said for Disestablishment in Wales ; but it is a mockery of representation—it is a *misrepresentation of facts*—to exclude from the House of Commons every representative of the very large minority of Welshmen who are of a different way of thinking from the majority on that subject. The abolition of plural voting, redistribution, readjustment, and the introduction of some sort of proportionate representation, are all urgently required to make the House of Commons respond to modern ideas of what a representative Chamber should be—a true reflection of the nation.

Mr. Asquith has asked, very rightly, that his plan for diminishing the authority of the House of Lords should be considered along with his proposal to shorten the statutory duration of the House of Commons. His scheme he wishes to be taken as a whole—as it affects our parliamentary system. Immediately before the sudden dissolution the Prime Minister added another most important ‘plank’ to ‘the platform’ of the Liberal party. What is virtually a single Chamber Legislature is to be established, and then the members of it are to be paid salaries out of the taxes! Taken ‘as a whole,’ it will be seen how complete in effect is the change which the Ministry propose to make in the old parliamentary Constitution of the realm.

In these later days it appears to be useless to appeal to Liberals in the cause of national economy. Formerly, in theory and in practice, Liberal statesmen warred against excessive expenditure ; and one of the worst ways of increasing expenditure is by the unnecessary multiplication of paid offices. But it is not solely or mainly in the cause of economy that we protest against salarying the House of Commons. It is because it will inevitably tend to lower the character and reputation of the House itself, of that ‘First Chamber’ upon which the credit of Parliament must always mainly depend. What the House of Commons is now chiefly suffering from, in public estimation, is the lack of independence amongst its members, their subservience to the caucus. The proposal is to create by a single stroke 670 offices with a salary of some hundreds a year each, the patronage of which is to be vested in the local caucuses. It is impossible to imagine means by which a greater injury could be inflicted on the character of the Representative Chamber. The mere passing of a ‘Payment of Members Act’ will lower its reputation even before the evil effects of the measure are felt. The House of Commons is master of the national purse, and it can distribute the produce of the

taxes in any manner that seems good to it; but if it values its own high standing in public estimation it will hesitate to make an exception in its own favour by absorbing amongst its members some half-million a year; whilst the general rule that public service is an honour and is unpaid remains in force not only 'in another place,' but in the many local representative bodies throughout the kingdom.

We have spoken of an expenditure of half a million a year; but if the system is introduced at all, it will become, and perhaps ought to become, far higher than that. In the United States of America these salaries have recently been increased, and now amount to 1500*l.* a year for each member of either House. On this scale the payment of the House of Commons alone would entail on the taxpayer a new annual expenditure exceeding a million. It seems almost a truism to observe that paid places will be regarded, and sought after, as paid places. The service of a member of Parliament ought to be as honourable a service as heretofore; but it can hardly be doubted that places of 1500*l.* a year will draw far abler men to fill them than places of 500*l.* or 300*l.* a year. There is no more honourable service rendered to the public than that performed by a British judge; but can anyone suppose that judgeships would be equally well filled if the judicial salary was 2000*l.* instead of 5000*l.* a year?

By too many Radicals and probably by the whole of the Labour Party it is thought desirable that the House of Commons should be composed of those who take up politics as a profession, and who make their living out of it. If a man devotes himself to politics in the House of Commons, why should he not, so runs the argument, for so doing be paid by the State, just as he is paid when he enters the service of the Crown. The two cases are entirely dissimilar. What the Crown wants from its servants on behalf of the State is exclusive service. Official salaries are paid on a sufficient, but not an exorbitant, scale, which, taken with the honour that attaches in this country to public service, does enable the Crown to avail itself of the best material to be had. Of course men whose main object it is to become very rich will not pursue a political career; and that this is so does no harm whatever to public life. It is well known that the majority of members make a very considerable pecuniary sacrifice in order to enter the House of Commons. What the public looks for in the servants of the Crown, and pays for, is skilled service, exclusive service, demanding all the best energies and all the time that the servant can give. What the public looks for in the House

of Commons is to be represented ; and it thinks, and rightly thinks, that it is better represented by men who do not give up their whole time to politics as if it were their sole profession, but who are engaged, or have been engaged, in the active life of the community—merchants, bankers, lawyers, country gentlemen, soldiers, sailors, working men, &c. It has been said that voluntary unpaid service in the House of Commons makes it impossible for working men to find a place there. To which it may be answered, first, that it does nothing of the kind ; secondly, that the vast majority of working men are under no greater disability than the vast majority of others in every class who cannot afford to sacrifice the earnings upon which they and their families subsist in order to spend many months of every year in attendance at Westminster. A House of Commons consisting entirely of ‘ professional ‘ politicians ’ would in our belief quite fail to fulfil its great purpose, of representing, we may almost say of being in miniature, the nation.

Mr. Asquith, in arguing at Hull against the ‘ Referendum,’ said rightly that the country desired in its representatives something more than mere irresponsible ‘ items ’ ; it needed representatives, not delegates. And we so far agree with him in thinking that there is no necessity for recourse to the ‘ Referendum,’ if we have an efficient Second Chamber and a truly representative House of Commons composed of men who feel their responsibilities to the country as well as to their party. This however is just the matter about which people who are not members of Parliament are beginning to have doubts. We are afraid that the Prime Minister’s feeling of contentment with the House of Commons as it stands is not shared by large numbers of well-wishers to our parliamentary institutions. They are convinced that the future of those institutions is dependent not merely on the redistribution of the authority and functions of the two Chambers, but on reforming the constitution of them both. It will be much to be regretted, since great questions are to be stirred, if the public does not take a sufficiently wide and comprehensive view of what is needed—the improving of *Parliament* and the raising of its character in the eyes of men. So far as the House of Lords goes, the Unionist leaders are on the right track. The conduct of the Peers during last session won them much public approval ; and sooner or later it seems probable that that Chamber will be reformed in the directions indicated. Lord Lansdowne’s words at Glasgow put the Unionist position clearly :

‘We shall, if we have the opportunity of dealing with this matter, largely reduce the present unwieldy numbers. We shall provide that no peer shall sit within the House of Lords solely by virtue of his hereditary line, and if he sits as an hereditary peer he must bring more credentials with him than the mere hereditary inheritance of his peerage. We shall endeavour to arrange for the retention in the reformed House of Lords of the best elements of the present House of Lords. I should be sorry to trust myself to say what I think of the value of those best elements. Perhaps however it may be wise if I content myself with saying that they are not bad. We should add a contingent of peers who owe their right to sit to certain unimpeachable qualifications, and finally we should reinforce the House by a body of Peers of Parliament from outside, chosen either by nomination by the Government of the day or by some form of election by public bodies; and in our view this outside element might represent somewhere about one-half of the reformed House.’

He would give to it the proper powers of a Second Chamber, foregoing all claim to deal with matters purely financial. ‘It should have the power of reserving grave and important questions for the opinion of the electors, and we should endeavour to provide reasonable means for settling by conference and joint sittings persistent differences between the two Houses whenever these differences might arise.’ That, he said, was the outline of the way in which they proposed to have a well-balanced Constitution. ‘At any rate that is the policy; and his Majesty’s Ministers refuse to discuss it.’ It is in all its essentials a Liberal policy, he might have added, fit to take rank with those policies of reform which in former days made the glory of the Liberal party.

Since last session and Parliament were brought to a close the electorate has been introduced to a new acquaintance—The Referendum. Statesmen, writers, thinkers, had of course long been aware of the system existing in Switzerland. What that system really is, and how far it appears to be applicable to British parliamentary institutions was fully considered in an article in the *Edinburgh Review* a year ago, to which we would refer our readers. It had, however, never been debated in the House of Commons, and even the word was hardly known to one elector in a hundred, till Mr. Balfour’s speech at the Albert Hall on the eve of the elections made it a practical question of the first importance.

The Leader of the Opposition pointed out the uncertainty that exists as to the meaning of the popular verdict given at a General Election, when, as is always the case, a number of issues are involved. He was most laudably anxious to secure

a national verdict against the Parliament Bill and Home Rule, and to eliminate so far as he could the fiscal issue, on which the Government party, as Free Traders, were certain to score heavily.

'The advantage of the Referendum is this—that the issue is quite clear and quite precise. It is not one of the mixed issues inevitably put before the constituencies at a General Election. It is perfectly easy to say when the Referendum is over, on what the Referendum was, whereas after a General Election, every man says it was upon the subject in which he was interested, if the election has gone in his favour. The Referendum has an enormous advantage. It does not involve a General Election; it does not involve all the personal bitterness inevitably involved in the contest between the two competitors for a seat; it does not carry with it a change of Government; and it does get a clear verdict from the people.'

He approved it as cheap and simple; and as a method of dealing with differences between the two Houses of Parliament, and he should have expected the Radical party to have jumped at it. The Radicals, however,

'tried to put him and his party in a hole by asking whether he would refer any really vital question upon which the two Houses are agreed, and in particular "Tariff Reform," to the Referendum. He had great sympathy with them when they put that question because they thought they had put him in a hole (laughter). But they hadn't (laughter and cheers).'

And Mr. Balfour went on to say that Tariff Reform being in fact a very great change he was ready to submit its 'principles' to the Referendum, as a condition precedent to the adoption of this change in our fiscal system, even should it be likely to find favour with both Houses of Parliament. This remarkable declaration, the immense gathering in the Albert Hall, thinking no doubt of its probable immediate effect upon the elections with regard to the fiscal differences between Unionists, received with a great outburst of cheering.

The declaration undoubtedly gave to Free Traders a great security. Its effect, they felt at once, was to render the danger they anticipated from Protection a much more remote one. If the Tariff Reformers should be in a majority in the House of Commons, which for reasons already given did not seem in any case a very probable contingency, the cause of Protection would be still very far from won. So far good. The declaration, however, cannot be regarded simply in its effect upon the fortunes of the fiscal controversy. Before that question can be practically raised the constitutional difficulty

has to be dealt with, and the Parliamentary system overhauled. In that regard the speech of the late Prime Minister—the Leader of the Conservative party—is of the very utmost importance and deserves much deeper consideration than in some quarters has evidently been given to it.

The truth is that neither the country nor the Unionist party have yet had the opportunity given them of thinking out the subject of the Referendum—what it means, or may mean. The proposal to introduce it, as part of the working system of the British Constitution, has to be judged on its own intrinsic merits, after full explanation and full debate in both Houses of Parliament.

Many people regard the Referendum, or a ‘Poll of the People’ (as some wish it to be called), as a means of arbitrating between the Houses of Parliament when persistent differences between the two have produced a deadlock. It is not impossible that out of this idea some practical proposal may some day grow; but it would seem reasonable, as great changes are suggested in the constitution of the two Houses, and in their relation to each other, to determine these first, before providing measures to guard us against the hopeless antagonism of the reformed Chambers. We should ourselves be inclined to take a more hopeful view of other suggestions made in the House of Lords, such as a ‘joint session’ or ‘conference’ between the Houses; and we would point out that the *Swiss* Referendum, which is generally in men’s minds when this word is used, cannot be employed to decide differences between the Chambers, and is only called into effect when it is desired to supersede them both.

It would not be fair to Mr. Balfour to forget the circumstances in which the Albert Hall speech was delivered. It was not his purpose to make a detailed explanation of a novel expedient which he was proposing to introduce into our Constitutional system. And his language hardly imported that he favoured the subjection after the *Swiss* pattern of the sovereignty of Parliament—King, Lords, and Commons—to a new authority. Amongst his followers, however, there are many who are as ready to bid for extreme democratic support as any Radical. That uncomfortably named body, the ‘Unionist Reveille Committee,’ regarding the Referendum from the point of view only of what they think will be its immediate effect on the policy of Home Rule and Tariff Reform, believe that this admirable and ‘most democratic offer’ will certainly save the Union and destroy Free Trade, and generally play their particular party game to the end of time. But it is far

from clear upon what reasoning they have arrived at a conclusion so satisfactory to themselves.

Mr. Balfour's speech certainly seemed to contemplate a poll of the people rather as a condition precedent to legislation than as a method of overruling the policy of Parliament. He was willing to refer the principles of Tariff Reform or the principle of Home Rule to a Referendum, and he saw no reason why a Conservative Government to whom the people refused Protection, or a Liberal Government to whom the people refused Home Rule, should not remain in office, pretty much as if nothing had occurred. That, no doubt, is what happens in Switzerland. But we are dealing not with Switzerland but with England, where the two root principles of our Constitution are the absolute sovereignty of Parliament and the responsibility of Ministers of the Crown to Parliament and the country for policy and conduct of affairs. It is evident that changes so fundamental must be very carefully scrutinised before they can be adopted.

The introduction of new institutions must always be regarded with special reference to our own conditions, and we listen with some hesitation when we are advised to follow foreign example without first assuring ourselves of the similarity of circumstances in the foreign country and in our own. A few years ago Irish Home Rule was recommended to us, amongst other reasons, because the system answered so well in Austria-Hungary, Iceland, Norway and Sweden! To-day it is suggested as a reproach that ours is almost the only country where representatives of the people are unpaid. Woman suffrage answers admirably, it is said, in New Zealand and Colorado, and the Referendum in the cantons of Switzerland. Let not the Mother of Parliaments be too proud to learn where she can; but let us remember at the same time that the recent experiments of a few comparatively insignificant States, in very different conditions from our own, hardly afford sufficient ground for our throwing aside institutions and practices which have grown up to suit ourselves.

Our laudable British habit has hitherto been to reform upon our own lines. If the Houses of Parliament are not what they should be, let us endeavour to obtain a better House of Lords and a better House of Commons. Recourse to the Swiss Referendum with its 'initiative,' and the subjection of 'the Lords 'Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in Parliament assembled' to the mass vote by ballot of the whole electorate, would be changes hardly less revolutionary than the withdrawal of the greater part of its authority from the Second Chamber. It is said that anything is better than single-chamber government;

—better the check upon that chamber of the referendum, than no check at all. Perhaps so; but that is not the position with which at present we have to deal. We believe in Parliamentary and Representative government by two Chambers; and as yet we see no reason for abandoning that system in despair for either ‘democratic’ panacea—‘a Single Chamber’ or a ‘People’s Poll.’ As these discussions proceed, it is hoped that more attention will be given as to the way in which the Referendum may be expected to work amongst us. Who is to put the question to the People, and how is it to be put? Is it seriously intended to submit a Welsh Disestablishment Bill, or an English Education Bill, to the whole electorate of the United Kingdom? It seems quite reasonable that such matters should come before the representatives of the whole nation, who can decide them on wider grounds than are taken locally. It may be an ‘un-democratic’ sentiment; but we certainly think that representation gives us 670 members very far above the general level of the electorate, and much more competent to deal with those matters than the seven million themselves. Above all we should welcome a little discussion of the probable disposition of the new supreme authority, before raising him to an absolute throne. What are likely to be his views, for instance, on direct and indirect taxation, or the distribution of landed and other property? The more the subject is pondered the more unwise it seems to make without the fullest consideration such a wide departure from our old ways. For many centuries it has been found possible to adapt our Parliamentary institution to the changing necessities of the time. But to abandon in despair the representative principle is a strange way to set about the improvement of Parliamentary government!

The immediate subject to be dealt with when Parliament meets will be the ‘Parliament Bill,’ which we hope will be regarded by the country merely as the opening up of the great question of the reform of both Houses, to which we have referred. The intrinsic difficulties of the problem hardly warrant the despondent tone of too many politicians at the present day. Parties, indeed, and party leaders have been thinking too much (to use Mr. Balfour’s homely phrase) of getting each other ‘into a hole,’ with the result that the nation itself will be in the same predicament unless statesmen show themselves sufficiently patriotic to rescue it. We see nothing to make us believe that patriotism, wisdom, and courage will not, as heretofore in British history, inspire our statesmanship, and enable the country to pass in safety through a time of difficulty and trial.

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
APRIL, 1911.*

No. CCCCXXXVI.

ART. I.—LORD ROSEBERY'S CHATHAM.

Chatham—His Early Life and Connections. By LORD ROSEBERY. London : Arthur L. Humphreys. 1910.

I

‘THE life of Chatham is extremely difficult to write, and, strictly speaking, can never be written at all . . . Further, it may be said that not merely is the complete life of Chatham difficult to write, but impossible. It is safe indeed to assert that it never has been written and never can be written . . . so we must be content with a torso.’

Such emphatic repetition by Lord Rosebery of his inability to conceive a satisfactory life of Chatham is hardly an encouraging exordium for a book dealing with the first fifty years of Chatham's life. Is such pessimism justified, is it even justified by Lord Rosebery's own performance as far as it carries us ? It is undeniable that no adequate biography has hitherto been written. Almon, who brought out his first edition of the ‘Anecdotes’ a few years after Chatham's death, though occasionally illuminating from his personal connexion with the statesman, is by no means satisfactory owing to the omissions in his book, its inaccuracy and its taint of Stowe House prejudice. Of Thackeray the best that can be said is that he achieved a *tour de force* in obscuring under his own dull verbosity the light of our most brilliant statesman ; but no mortal man would willingly wade through his two large quartos except

* All rights reserved.

perhaps for the author's conscientious accumulation of illustrative documents. Lastly, within the last decade, a German scholar, Herr von Ruville, has produced a book of immense learning and much shrewd comment on European politics, which however is entirely spoilt as a life of Chatham by the author's misplaced ingenuity in torturing his victim's every action to suit his own preconceived theory based on ill-digested Darwinian principles of heredity. Hitherto the only worthy tribute to Chatham's greatness are the two essays of Macaulay. But splendid as they are, they are not a life of the man, merely a comment on the public manifestations of his patriotic energy.

So much for the past. Is there any inherent necessity that the future should be equally barren? Is there any fundamental reason why the only writers who have hitherto attempted a complete biography have been men unable to catch the spark of genius from their subject and re-invest him with his own fires? It is true men of other mould have been attracted by the idea of his life, but they have given it up in despair. Carlyle himself, brought face to face with Chatham in his 'Frederick the Great,' seems to have regretted that his days were then numbered and remarked wistfully that this 'authentically Royal kind of man' must be left to some other 'Plutarch in these times, with a good deal of leisure on his hands.' He even appears to have pitched upon his Plutarch in one of the younger generation well equipped by tradition, temperament and knowledge to undertake the task had he been so minded. Perhaps, however, no one without the instinctive vision of a Carlyle could have achieved it at that time when the material was so scanty; and it is one of the almost irreparable losses to literature that the biographer of Cromwell should not have lent his genius to enable Chatham to flash out on succeeding generations in all the splendour of his life.

Chatham's aloofness from his age has always presented the hardest obstacle to surmount for a writer of his biography. It was an age of diaries and gossipy letters, of memoirs and exhaustive self-explanations which explained nothing of any permanent interest to the world. Such materials deal adequately with all whose lives are made up of the superficialities of life and whose minds are commonplace. Our fussy old Duke of Newcastle we know; for he lived entirely on the trivialities common to all ages. Chesterfield in youth showed signs of power not visible to the idling courtier, but he preferred to exercise his gifts in doing supremely well what all the rest of his world attempted and taking his revenge on himself and them by his facile wit: in that capacity we know him too, for such

brilliant triflers are always with us. Even Sir Robert Walpole we know *ad unguem*: for, though he was a great minister, there was no width of view, no depth to plumb in his composition, his greatness consisting entirely in the common sense he brought to bear on each question as it arose. Carteret also in his more obvious aspect we know, as a scholar, a wit and a boon companion; it is only when we suddenly come upon his great ambitions, on his large conceptions of foreign policy, in a word on his most distinctive side that he eludes us, for that passed the comprehension of the chroniclers of the day, who therefore neglect it. So is it with Chatham: his faults and idiosyncrasies, his dramatic appearances and all the outward show of the man are noted and commented upon abundantly; even the grandeur of his eloquence, intelligible to the simplest, is recognised; but his intimate life, the motives that spurred him to action and his thoughts and aims for England—of these, if he spoke at all, it was in a language not understood by the Horace Walpoles, the Dodingtons, or even the worthy Waldegraves of the day; and they remain unmarked in their chronicles. This might have mattered less had we possessed enough intimate letters revealing the man's soul. But these have hitherto proved singularly scarce. There are no such details about Chatham's life either in his own letters or those of others, as enable us to recast the personalities of many smaller men almost from their cradles to their graves and to read their minds as in an open book. Until within the last few years nearly everything connected with Chatham before he burst forth in full glory at the age of forty-eight was uncertain or a matter of surmise. There was little record of his ancestry, still less of his education and the influences that formed his character: his extant correspondence only began when he was thirty-three years old and was almost confined to business letters or premeditated effusions. It was believed that he had travelled abroad on no other evidence than his statement in a speech that he had seen the junction of the Rhone and the Saone at Lyons. Even his speeches were so ill-reported that little idea of their effect could be obtained from reading them, while his real part in organising the victories which made his ministry famous had to be taken on trust from vague stories, since no attempt had been made to extract the truth from his despatches. Above all there was hardly anything to give us a conception of Chatham at home and at his ease or to enable the conditions postulated by Lord Rosebery for a good biography to be fulfilled.

'We want to know,' he says in his preface, 'how a master man talked, and if possible what he thought. What was his standpoint with regard to the grave issues of life; what he was in his hours of ease, what he enjoyed, how he unbent; in a word what he was without his wig and bag and sword, in his dressing gown and slippers with a friend, a novel, or a pipe.'

This dearth of intimate information explains well enough why there has been no great biography of Chatham in the past. But within the last few years much has changed. Colonel Yule by his scholarly edition of Hedges's *Diary for the Hakluyt Society* and the *Historical MSS. Commission's* publication of the *Dropmore* papers have cleared away much of the obscurity which involved Pitt's immediate ancestry. His ministerial genius has been manifested in the series of his despatches relating to the American War which have recently been published under the auspices of an American Society. The *Chatham MSS.* have also for some time been accessible in the Record Office; and, although the hundred bundles of the elder Pitt's papers contain morasses of useless writing which no man needs, yet among them are a few shining islands of testimony to his character and habits.

Still there was little, if anything, of Chatham's own during the early years when a man's bent is formed and fixed. But to supply this want Lord Rosebery has now come to the rescue with some letters produced for his inspection by Mr. Fortescue from his *Dropmore* collection. They are letters written by William Pitt or about him over a period extending from his fourteenth year when he was at Eton until his thirtieth when he was already a noted member of Parliament. Most of them are addressed by William to his favourite sister Ann and are written in a familiar and easy style, very different from most examples of his correspondence. It seems remarkable that Mr. Fitzpatrick, whether because they were withheld from him or were overlooked, should have been entirely unaware of these letters, perhaps the most interesting of all the papers at *Dropmore*, when he was editing that collection for the government: we can only now be grateful that they have at last seen the light. The interest of these letters is twofold. In the first place they throw light on several doubtful incidents and dates in Pitt's early life. From them we learn when he left Oxford, where he studied afterwards, how long he travelled on the continent, the places he visited, his travelling companions, his convivial exploits as a cornet of horse, and even a passing love-affair. All these points are of some little importance for his biographer. But more interesting far is the

revelation of William's nature in the intimate letters to Ann. Here, for example, is Pitt in a novel aspect, trying to write in George Lyttelton's room with romping girls outside battering on the door to break in and drag him out to play :

‘ London, March y^o 13, 1731.

‘ I am now locked into George's room ; the girls thundering at the door as if heaven and earth would come together : I am certainly the warmest brother, or the coldest gallant in the universe, to suffer the gentle impertinences, the sportly solicitations of two girls not quite despicable without emotion, and bestow my time and spirits upon a sister : but in effect the thing is not so strange or unreasonable, for every man may have girls worthy of his attention, but few sisters so conversable as my Dear Nanny. ‘Tis impossible to say much, amidst the rocking of the doors, chairs and tables. I fancy myself in a storm of the utmost danger and horror . . . let the winds roar, and the big torrent burst ! I won't leave my Nanny for any lady of you all, but with the warmest assurance of unalterable affection, Adieu.’

Here he is in a more serious mood, though no less loving, as he chides his sister for her alarm at reports that he means to marry and leave her :

‘ Northampton, May y^o 21, 1731.

‘ What shall I say to my dearest Nanny for sinking into a tenderness below the dignity of her spirit and genius ? I sat down with a resolution to scold you off for a little loving fool, but find myself upon examination your very own brother and as fond of receiving such testimonies of the excess of yr affection, as you are of bestowing them. . . . ’

In such letters for the first time we catch a glimpse of the great Secretary writing and almost thinking aloud in unpremeditated strains. Some of the letters to his wife already published are full of charm and deep affection, as the one in which he talks to her about his eldest daughter in the garden : ‘ The principal event of Hayes is Hetty's chase of a butterfly, which she pursued over the daisy lawn, with the ardour of a little nymph of Dian's train ; the sport was growing too hot, and we wisely agreed to whip off, and renew the hunt another day.’

But whatever he may have been in his talk to his wife and children he is never in his letters quite so natural and spontaneous as in these letters to the sister who most resembled him and the only one of his family with whom he was on terms of complete fellowship and sympathy.

Besides these inestimable letters, Lord Rosebery contributes other new material for a life of Chatham. He has

discovered, also at Dropmore, a memoir of the Pitt family prepared by the first Lord Camelford, the nephew Thomas of the letters on education, and quotes from it extensively. It is true that Lord Camelford repaid Chatham's generosity to him by cordially detesting him and shows his venom in almost every comment on his uncle; but, after due discount for this prejudice, much valuable family information is to be derived from the memoir, as well as interesting side-lights on Chatham's history and opinions. His description of his uncle's eloquence, for example, is the best we have seen, especially in one phrase worthy of Chatham himself: 'He deviated into a thousand digressions, often reverted back to the same ground, and seemed sometimes like the lion to lash himself with his own tail to rouse his courage.' Lastly Lord Rosebery has had the advantage of permission to look through the MSS. at Holland House and has extracted therefrom a few hitherto unpublished letters of Henry Fox, which add a little to our knowledge of the complicated negotiations and intrigues between the death of Pelham and Pitt's first ministry.

So far from agreeing with Lord Rosebery's pessimistic views as to the possibility of a satisfactory life of Chatham, we believe that he himself has now contributed the material which was chiefly needed to make up the essential information required. All the salient incidents of his public career have long been known, a fairly accurate idea of his outward semblance and of the impression his oratory conveyed to his contemporaries can be gathered from their literary remains; what were really lacking were some details about his youthful years, and about his feelings before his character was fixed and while he still had a sister dear enough to receive the natural outpourings of his heart. It is true that with him, as probably with every great man who looked beyond the horizon of his age, much has still to be guessed at by a sympathetic writer who has been able from the ample material now existing to constitute the man Chatham truly enough in the broad outlines of his nature, and can say of him in the few doubtful cases left what kind of motive must have swayed his judgement or his action. It is no doubt unfortunate, as Lord Rosebery points out, that no such intimate letters as he produces to illuminate his youth throw light on his declining years. But they are not so indispensable for that period, when his character was formed and his energies were concentrated on public affairs and the education of his children, on both which subjects we have ample information.

We venture indeed to feel strengthened in our belief that there is now adequate material for a life of Chatham by our own experience. In the number of this Review for July 1910 we attempted an account of Chatham's early years and training. This account has to be corrected in a few matters of fact by the new material disclosed by Lord Rosebery ; a few of the statements there advanced tentatively can now be made absolutely. But in essentials we can say with some satisfaction that no important correction is needed, while the character of Chatham and the bent of his mind there indicated are amply confirmed by the illuminating documents now revealed for the first time. Thus the series of letters to Ann fully bears out what we said about his fond relations with that sister, and makes manifest the tenderness of his nature, for which incidental hints were hitherto our only authority. We have, therefore, the more confidence in believing that with the new light now available it is quite reasonable to expect some more complete historical and satisfactory representation of Chatham than has hitherto appeared.

II

How far has Lord Rosebery succeeded in his torso, as he calls his account of Chatham's early life and connexions ? He brings some of the highest possible qualifications to the task. A long public career familiarising him with all the depths and heights of politics ; eloquence of a high order such as would create a fellow-feeling for one of Chatham's greatest gifts ; a connexion with Chatham's family giving him the free-masonry of all the family traditions so elusive but so all-important for the creation of the right atmosphere about his hero ; leisure for research ; a mind trained to weigh the value of documentary evidence and apply to it the common-sense experience of practical life ; pre-eminent literary gifts ; and an unerring eye for telling effects in history : all these qualifications Lord Rosebery possesses, and he makes full use of them in this volume. In a word Lord Rosebery's gifts as a writer are brilliant, and his judgement is sane. This life of Chatham can certainly not be accused of being pitched upon too high a key of enthusiasm, and with all its moderation of tone it abounds in passages of coruscating brilliance.

The passages which will justly arrest most attention are the portraits of some of the chief men in Horace Walpole's world with

whom Pitt was brought into contact. George II., Frederick Prince of Wales, Sir Robert Walpole, Carteret, Pulteney, Newcastle, Fox, Bubb Dodington are described with a master hand. Though there is little new in these descriptions, for there was not much more to be known about most of them, how wonderfully Lord Rosebery has, by his incisive phrases, hit off and fixed for posterity the characters of these worthies. What could be better said than this of Bubb Dodington? 'There are always parasites of this kind in politics, universally mistrusted, and yet constantly taken into confidence on grounds of convenience. Always sympathetic, always warm, always ready to betray at the first symptom of personal advantage, they are nevertheless useful parts of the political machine, and not so contemptible as might appear.' Or this of Carteret? 'He played his political chess with the big pieces alone, and neglected the pawns. He disregarded not merely the soldiers and most of the officers, but all the arts and equipment of the parliamentary army, heedless of the fact that parliamentary support is the necessity of a British minister.' But of all the pictures that for which we are most grateful is of the Grenville brotherhood. History has in the past been too kind to these Grenvilles, especially to George, whose reputation has gained by the English habit of taking unctuous rectitude at its own valuation and of mistaking unimaginative dulness for solid worth. Their credit was also maintained by the fact that they controlled a large part of the press of the day; Burke by his famous encomium on George further supported it. Rosebery has done service by putting them in their proper place. George Grenville's priggishness and self-seeking are shown in their true light. As for Temple, who had fewer friends, Lord Rosebery finds it an easy task to demolish the unfortunate critic who said of him that he was one of the 'most straightforward, honest and honourable men of his age.' That he was 'a selfish and tortuous intriguer, who hoped to utilise his brother-in-law's genius and popularity for practical objects of his own' is evidently much nearer the mark. Lord Rosebery indeed nowhere displays the same enthusiasm as in the sport of tracking down Temple's windings in his pursuit of wealth, power, and a ducal coronet. In one detail only does he appear to us at fault, where he suggests that Temple in later life lost the 'careless countenance and laugh' which Pitt admired in 1735. To the end, Temple half deceived the world by these outward semblances of good humour. In 1771 Mrs. Hood describes his boisterous spirits and coarse pleasantries at the marriage of his niece, and he was always, as we read

him, a *faux bonhomme*, if ever there was one, full of chaff and noisy laughter.

Another excellence in this book is the author's faculty for making brief and lucid summaries of obscure and complicated historical events. His chapter on the war of the Austrian succession is one of the best instances. This war has always been something of a mystery. What powers were fighting at any given moment, what they were fighting about and against whom, are questions which, in Leslie Stephen's words, 'a man can only answer when he has been specially crammed for examination, and his knowledge has not begun to ooze out.' Nevertheless the answers to these questions are important to those interested in Pitt's career, and we have never seen a clearer statement of the main reasons for this war and its principal incidents than in the dozen pages in which Lord Rosebery sets them forth. A military student or an historical specialist would naturally ask for more detail, but to understand Pitt's connexion with the war the passage is enlightening and sufficient. Another stumbling block to all students of Pitt's career has always been the intricate course of negotiations which led to the formation of his first ministry. Through these we are guided with such unerring skill by Lord Rosebery, that we only wish he could have gone further and undertaken the still more difficult task of unravelling the intrigues and clearly explaining all the complicated negotiations between 1763 and 1766 directed to the object of restoring Pitt to the ministry. Moreover, when he makes excursions into the course of external events, Lord Rosebery never forgets his own maxim that 'the provinces of history and biography, though they overlap, are essentially distinct.' Consequently his narrative is never overburdened with irrelevant details.

But great as these merits are, they do not in themselves constitute excellence in a biography. For that the subject himself must stand forth boldly and his characteristics must be faithfully represented. In these two essentials we do not think Lord Rosebery has been entirely successful.

First as to the clearness of outline given to Chatham's personality. It is true that the man himself is never lost sight of in a tangle of irrelevant historical matter. Everything subsidiary to the main interest is nicely adjusted to scale. The only trouble is that Chatham himself is not adequately realised; he does not dominate the stage as he should. The scenery is all perfectly conceived, the minor players all have their cues, they make their exits and their entrances with punctuality and ease, the accessories which give the right

atmosphere to the piece are irreproachable: in a word the drama is admirably stage-managed. But the hero of the piece is a different person in every scene. We see Pitt as a boy at school or an undergraduate at Oxford, as a soldier in country quarters, as a fond brother, as a traveller, as a hesitating lover, as a member of Opposition, as a minor minister, and of course also as a great orator. He is always interesting, but there is no adequate reconciliation of the various parts, hardly an attempt to create the impression that it is the same man throughout. Least of all are we prepared for Pitt's self-revelation as the greatest of our statesmen, unrivalled whether in large conceptions of policy or in the practical mastery of detail. Lord Rosebery indeed breaks off advisedly before this great period in his career, but should we not have been led on to expect it? If Pitt is to be left in 1756 just before the curtain is rung up for the great scene, ought we not to feel that what we know already of him makes his glory inevitable? This transition Lord Rosebery has not made any easier for us. We still do not understand after reading this biography what Chatham's mind was like, how he trained it and how he came to be what he was. There is none of that 'prophetic eye of taste,' none of that sympathetic identification of the author with his subject, equally needful for the biographer as for the writer of romance.

We have already by implication answered the further question how far Lord Rosebery succeeds in bringing out Chatham's leading characteristics. What are those we should especially associate with him? The first is eloquence. He was probably the greatest English orator that has ever lived. In conveying the impression that he was so Lord Rosebery achieves, we think, his greatest success. He analyses all the reports that have come down to us of the speeches made before 1756, quotes some of the most impressive descriptions of his eloquence by contemporaries, and finally weaves all this material into an ideal picture of one of Chatham's great speeches, in a passage which is one of the best pieces of writing in the book.

' . . . Suddenly the rich notes swell into the fulness of a great organ, and the audience find themselves borne into the heights of a sublime burst of eloquence. Then he sinks again into a whisper full of menace which carries some cruel sarcasm to some quivering heart. Then he is found playing about his subject, pelted snow-balls as he proceeds. . . . So all through the speech men sit as though paralysed, though many are heated with wine. . . . And as he sits down perhaps with little applause, the tension of nerves

almost agonising in its duration and concentration, snaps like a harp string; the buzz of animated conversation breaks forth with an ecstasy of relief.'

There indeed speaks the born orator, who has himself tasted some of the joys of such rapt attention!

It would be a fascinating study to pick out from the various accounts of each known speech what could be fixed as Chatham's own words. Even witnesses in the House of Commons who reported their personal impressions of his speeches do not always agree. For example a famous passage about Carteret is thus reported by Philip Yorke: 'an execrable, a sole minister, 'who had renounced the British nation and seemed to have 'drunk of the potion described in poetic fictions, which made 'men forget their country,' while Montagu, who was also present, renders it thus: 'a minister . . . who had eat of a 'certain tree that the Poet tells us makes people forget their 'country, but he hoped the people would never taste of the 'fruit of the same tree nor after his example forget their 'country.' The phrase does not appear in any shape in the report given by Gordon in the 'London Magazine' which generally seems more faithful than the 'Gentleman's Magazine' whose reporter was Dr. Johnson. But it is well known that neither of these magazines gave verbatim reports of Chatham's speeches, and one has to judge of their inherent probability from a comparison with some of his later speeches after 1760, of which the authenticity is better established. From analogies drawn from these we may assert with some confidence that certain expressions in the earlier reports can hardly have been used by anybody but Pitt himself. Such is the remark in a speech of 1740 about a provision suggested for a Navy Bill, 'that it will 'consume the manufacture of paper and swell the book of 'statutes is all the good or hurt that can be hoped or feared 'from a law like this; a law which fixes what is in its own 'nature mutable, which prescribes rules to the seasons and 'limits to the wind'; or the simile of King George standing 'on the firm ground of his people's affections tho' on the brink of a precipice. It is the duty of Parliament to snatch him from the gulph where an infamous minister has placed him and not throw paltry flowers on the edge of it to conceal the danger; it may be a rough but it is a friendly hand which is stretched out to remove him.'

It is only just in reckoning up the sources of information on Pitt's oratory to pay a tribute of gratitude to Horace Walpole for his reports, brief and hurried as they often were. For a

considerable number of the speeches he is our only authority, and wherever his account can be tested by the light of independent testimony his accuracy even in phraseology is triumphantly confirmed. For example, several of Pitt's speeches during his ministry and for the first few years after his resignation are to be found in the Prussian archives epitomised either by Frederick's envoys or others; and in every such case they tally remarkably with Walpole's account. Even when Walpole himself was not present, as at the celebrated speech on the address of January 14, 1766, when he was at Paris the accuracy of the report he secured from others is confirmed by other evidence, such as can be found in Lord Charlemont's or Lord George Sackville's papers. And in almost every case Walpole gives, what can be found nowhere else, so graphic an account of the general atmosphere of the debate and of the arguments used by other speakers that Pitt's speeches acquire added verisimilitude. It is indeed interesting to note how, though Walpole never felt unmixed enthusiasm for the orator, even during those four years of national glory when he was momentarily carried off his feet by their author, he is always forced to make Pitt the central figure in any debate wherein he took part. Certainly with the aid of Walpole and of the few speeches reported by Sir Philip Francis and Hugh Boyd, of which the accuracy is almost undisputed, it is possible to obtain a very clear conception of Chatham's greatness as an orator and even to reconstruct with some plausibility a good many of the 160 odd speeches, of which there is certain testimony. Lord Rosebery indeed hardly does justice to his own powers when he gives to the reader Walpole's notes of speeches out of their context without attempting to amplify them from the other sources of information available and make them more living by the touch of sympathy.

Perhaps the most notable feature of Chatham's oratory was the extraordinary fertility of his invention in treating a topic. In enforcing his points he left nothing to chance. After stating his proposition, he would ransack ancient history for illustrations of his meaning, or at another time use the homeliest incidents of everyday life even to his own and his opponents' idiosyncrasies. When discussing the Bristol Nightly Watch Bill he referred to the habits of the Romans, but his own crutch, a child's go-cart or an incident of travel came just as handily to him, to illustrate some of his most magnificent effects. His metaphors are never purple patches, but so woven into the texture of his arguments as to seem inevitable and indispensable. Even the most hostile audiences were held spell-bound

by his torrential force. During one of his onslaughts on Murray, we are told Murray sat through it suffering for an hour, while on the same occasion, when Foote and Murphy were in the gallery, Foote said to Murphy who wanted to go home, 'No, let us wait till he has made the little man vanish entirely.' There is a well-known description once popular with public reciters of the similar effect of the Moonlight sonata on some ignorant countryman, glued to his seat by the insistent melody of the music. Indeed the nature of Chatham's eloquence is akin to that of Beethoven's music. Just as Beethoven never leaves the air he has once given you until all the sweetness and the grandeur have been extracted from it by simple statement and by every conceivable form of variation, even returning to it, when you think it is done with, to draw from it one more forgotten strain of sweetness or of tragedy, so Chatham played over his subject with almost infinite power of variation and metaphor, expressing sweetness, grandeur, scorn or indignation with all the aid given him by his noble presence, his flashing eye, and his voice of unsurpassed modulations. It must have been with Chatham as we still feel with Beethoven, that when he had done there was nothing more to be said. Even from the poorest reports of his speeches, though the look, the tone, and even the actual words he used are sometimes missing, his invariable superiority to other speakers in exhausting the subject and taking the broadest views is amply apparent.

Chatham had one characteristic in common with most men of genius, which no biographer—and Lord Rosebery is no exception—dwells upon sufficiently: his capacity of self-control and self-education. A curious instance is given by his nephew of his power of abandoning a bad habit at a time of life when illness would, one might have expected, have weakened his self-command. 'When I first saw him, he was intemperate towards his servants . . . but it is to his honour that when he owed a better example to his children he got the better of that habit.' Other indications prove that if he had great gifts their lustre was kept bright by constant exertion and study. The extracts from his commonplace book printed at the end of his correspondence show the deep thought he devoted to religious and constitutional questions, and his unpublished notes at the Record Office illustrate the care with which he got up the subjects of his speeches and of his active duties as minister. He prepared himself, for example, for his attacks on Walpole by studying and copying out the precedents of Parliamentary enquiries into the conduct of Buckingham,

Strafford, Somers, and Portland. From an early period he kept at hand tabulated statements of military and naval establishments both in England and in foreign countries, noted details of our foreign and colonial trade, and, to judge from the items in his booksellers' accounts, kept himself thoroughly informed in all the best writings on historical, constitutional, and political subjects. His elaborate notes of evidence taken before the Committee of Enquiry into Walpole's Administration show that as far as he was concerned it was not meant to be a fiasco, and that he took his first introduction to the secrets of ministerial work very seriously. This industry in preparing carefully for a cause he had at heart never left him throughout his life. When Paymaster he was admired by his subordinates for the attention he devoted to the business of his office; his letters to his ungrateful nephew, Thomas Pitt, are no less remarkable for the pains taken in thinking out the best training for an aspirant to politics than for the soundness of the advice offered; and though in this instance the trouble was ill-repaid it no doubt helped him in the still more anxious care he devoted in after years to his own children's up-bringing. His despatches as a minister could only have been the work of a man who had studied every detail required for the success of an enterprise as well as the broad outlines of the policy dictating it. For the Wilkes business he had searched out all the precedents with his friend Camden, and evolved a constitutional theory which has never since been seriously questioned, so firmly based is it on the study of our laws; while his attempts to solve the American question were not mere instinctive flashes, but elaborated after anxious discussion with Franklin and other thinkers. On those too rare occasions in the last twelve years of life when he emerged from his enforced retreat to bear a part in politics it is remarkable to notice in the pages of the Rockingham, Grenville and Shelburne correspondence the energy he always aroused by his own vigour in the ranks of the Opposition. In those spasms he worked himself unmercifully, dictating letters, arranging interviews, making speeches and stirring up all the timid warblers of the grove to unwonted business in their turn.

In his speeches he was remarkable for the accuracy of his facts, and he constantly indicated his acquaintance with matters known only to a limited few, especially on questions of foreign affairs. This secret knowledge was not due to any prophetic power of divination, as his eccentric granddaughter seemed to hint, but, as his note-books reveal, to his industry in collecting information. An interesting example

of his means of obtaining accurate intelligence is noticed in the last volume of Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Among his papers appears a complete scheme for the invasion of England by Choiseul, with all the memoranda of the French spies. It is not known how he came into possession of these papers, but it can hardly have been through the ordinary diplomatic channels, since most of them are dated after the time that he had ceased to be a minister. He certainly never confined himself to the melodramatic secret agents, so dear to Newcastle, for his information, and probably obtained much of it by a common-sense use of his vast acquaintance. In Lord Rosebery's volume an instance is quoted of his impressing the services of his sister to make known some information to the Court of France at a time when we were at war with that country, and no doubt such methods were not uncommon with him. The important point to be noticed, however, is that the accumulation of all the information to which Chatham was adding throughout his life must have entailed energy and labour which are quite enough to account for his frequent break-downs and certainly deserve more attention in his biographies than they have hitherto received.

A question which must always present itself about Chatham is as to the reason for the early and continuous feeling of confidence with which he inspired the great mass of his countrymen. Lord Rosebery hardly insists enough upon the fact, still less does he satisfactorily account for it. Indeed, he seems almost to suggest in one passage that the chief reason why Pitt was called for by the people in 1756 was that he was the only prominent man as yet untried in the crisis. It is true he had never so fully revealed his oratorical powers as in the two years from 1754 to 1756, but, as a man and a statesman, his pre-eminence had been widely recognised almost from the first. Even before he first appeared in Parliament he had been acclaimed as a leader by the young politicians of his generation, and Walpole's vengeance on him only gave notoriety to that view. In 1742 Montagu said of him that he was 'in the opinion of several, as well as me, a greater man than ever I have sat with, and if he preserves his integrity, will be transmitted to posterity in the most illustrious of characters'; and in the following year Philip Yorke wrote that 'Pitt grows the most popular speaker in the House of Commons and is at the head of his party.' In 1745 Lyttelton describes the terrified Scottish members coming to him for counsel. A year later, on his accepting a subordinate post in the ministry,

testimony is borne to the fact that his fame had gone beyond the limits of Great Britain by no less a person than Frederick the Great, who wrote to his minister Andrié :

‘ Comme j’ai reconnu que les sentimens que celui-ci [Pitt] a eus sont dignes d’un véritable Anglais, mon intention est que vous deviez prendre l’occasion à lui faire un compliment très-obligeant de ma part, en l’assurant de toute mon estime, et combien je souhaitais que ses sentimens fussent bien établis ; que l’Angleterre et la Prusse seraient toujours alors dans la plus étroite harmonie du monde, ce qui ne pouvait se faire aussi souvent que l’Angleterre fut regentée des vues particulières d’Hanovre.’

In that ministry, though he never rose above the very subordinate rank of Paymaster-General, he was consulted constantly on foreign policy by both Pelham and Newcastle, and when, as not infrequently occurred, the two brothers were hardly on speaking terms with each other, Pitt received the confidences of each in turn, and sometimes succeeded in reconciling their differences. One of the least-known parts of Pitt’s life is the eight years before Pelham’s death, when he was not in Opposition, and made few speeches in Parliament of sufficient importance to be recorded by his contemporaries. But although he was not so prominent in Parliament he evidently had not lost ground either with his colleagues in the House of Commons or in the country. It is true that just before he became the Secretary of State he had conducted his brilliant and unrelenting campaign against Newcastle and Murray, but that passage of arms was too brief in itself to explain the extraordinary confidence with which the people of England welcomed his assumption of office. The country gentlemen flocked up from the country, as they had never done before, to support his measures in Parliament ; while his hold on the nation, before he had even had time to prove his mettle as a minister, is proved by the spontaneity with which on his first dismissal from the Secretaryship in April 1757 gold boxes rained on him from places so far apart and of such diverse interests as London, Newcastle, Dublin, Exeter, Bedford, Tewkesbury, York, Bristol, Berwick, Norwich, Cork, Bath, Stirling, Chester, Yarmouth, Boston, Worcester and Windsor. Women, always quick to appreciate signs of mastery in a man, recognised his greatness from the first. Those two very dissimilar but equally critical dames, the Duchesses of Marlborough and Queensberry, acknowledged his power. Mrs. Montagu, the great blue-stocking, almost worshipped him, and her sister ‘ had no inclination to dance with any man but Mr. Pitt.’ Molly West had

such 'implicit faith in Mr. Pitt's taste and judgement' that she braved all weathers to admire his grounds and rococo temples; while Lady Hester Grenville, to judge from her friend Lady Cathcart's letters, had kept him a place in her heart, long before he had made his love known to her.

This widespread confidence in Pitt arose partly from the conviction he inspired of his single-minded devotion to public duty, still more from his own early recognition of the importance of popular confidence to sanction his ideals and enable him to pursue them into action. Herr Salomon, in one of the best modern appreciations of Chatham, says that his strength lay in his appeal from the oligarchy, that had been founded on the ruins of absolute monarchy, to the people at large. This remark is very true and is illustrated by the whole course of Pitt's political career. One of his first actions after losing his commission was to drive about the country alone, appealing, as it were, from the minister to those who should be his masters. Almost from the outset his speeches recognise, as those of no other contemporary, the responsibility of Parliament to the nation, and the importance of the nation's views being adequately represented. In one of his earliest speeches he brings out this point of view. 'Our time,' he says, 'cannot be more usefully employed, during a war, than examining how it has been conducted and settling the degree of confidence that may be reposed in those to whose care are entrusted our reputations, our fortunes, and our lives.' After the fall of Walpole he, almost alone, spoke up for the people's wishes when others who had reached power by advocating them had already forgotten them. He laid stress on the demands from the constituencies for enquiry and reform, reminding Parliament of its ancient claim to be called the Grand Inquest of the Nation. He thundered against those who 'make light of the sentiments or suspicions of the people'; and while admitting that 'the voice of the House was formerly . . . and always ought to be the voice of the people,' he questioned in Walpole's time, as he did again in George III.'s, whether the gentlemen then in office, with their pensioners and placemen, had in any sense marked that voice. He not only based his own power on the will of the people, but he made that will a power for good by appealing to the nation's better instincts, by uniting Englishmen in a common pride in themselves; in a word by directing all the latent energy in a corporate multitude to the country's highest interests. Thus he told the House of Commons that our quick recovery of credit after the South Sea collapse 'was founded upon the conduct of the nation and not upon the

'wisdom or justice of the measures taken to restore it.' He consorted with the Allens, the Cummings and the Beckfords, men previously of a class little accounted in politics, from a sure instinct that they were in touch with the most enterprising parts of the community. By his Militia Bill he taught Englishmen to use their strength instead of committing the protection of their honour and their liberties to foreign mercenaries. By such means, when the time came, he had forged himself a sword of victory in a united people.

Even King's speeches he put to good use for his purpose. Instead of the customary dull, formal phrases, inspired by him they became trumpet-calls to action and union. We know from Walpole and other sources that Pitt himself during his ministry gave these speeches their final shape, if he was not himself responsible for their entire composition; and even had we not been told, we might have guessed it from the difference between their tone and that of the years preceding and succeeding. In them the King is no longer made to speak as a being apart, giving vague indications of policy or tepid encouragement to his faithful subjects. But he makes himself one with his people; his policy is their policy; and he is never tired of harping on the central idea of Pitt's statecraft, united and harmonious effort. In the speech of December 1756, even before Pitt was well in the saddle, this note is struck: 'I trust that (under the guidance of Divine Providence) union and firmness in my affectionate people will carry me with honour through all difficulties.' Next year the same note is heard in a more assured tone:

'I have the firmest confidence that the spirit and bravery of this nation, so renowned in all times, and which have formerly surmounted so many difficulties, are not to be abated by some disappointments. These, I trust, by the blessing of God and your zeal and ardour for my honour and the welfare of your country may be retrieved. In this critical conjuncture the eyes of all Europe are upon you';

and the speech concludes with an appeal impressive in its homely identification of the Monarch with all Englishmen: 'Nothing can be so conducive to the defence of all that is dear to us, as well as for reducing our enemies to reason, as union and harmony amongst ourselves.' In the three remaining speeches at the opening of the Session during his ministry Pitt no longer found it necessary to urge unity on a nation drawn together by his genius, but the topic is too congenial to be omitted. The King therefore is made to congratulate his Parliament on 'that happy extinction of divisions and that

'union and good harmony which continue to prevail amongst my subjects . . . a situation so essential to the true and lasting felicity of this great people.' In such words as these we undoubtedly hear the same voice as that of the man who with his dying breath protested against 'the dismemberment of this ancient and most noble monarchy,' and asked how a people 'that fifteen years ago was the terror of the world' could stoop so low as to tell its ancient, inveterate enemy, 'take all we have, only give us peace.'

Notable too is the man's sincerity. Herr von Ruville laboured through most of his three volumes in the attempt to prove that Pitt only cared for personal aggrandisement and that his patriotic heroics were simply a cloak for his desire of office. Even Lord Rosebery puts down his attacks on Walpole and Carteret to factious opposition. 'His course,' he says, summing up his career before 1746, 'has been one of brilliant recklessness and of striking eloquence; but at bottom it had been nothing but faction'; or again, comparing his career to that of

'other ambitious and not very scrupulous politicians,' he says, 'he begins by attacking Sir Robert Walpole. Why? He has no particular objection to Sir Robert Walpole; in after years he acknowledges that he was a great statesman. It was partly a freak of youth. Who is the biggest man to attack, the man by combating whom one can acquire the most honours and reputation? Obviously Walpole. So tilt at him.'

These conclusions show, we believe, an entire misapprehension of Chatham's nature. No doubt he was determined to make himself felt in politics and to become prominent, as would any man who felt in himself the divine certainty implanted in his breast, that he and he alone could save the country. But that he attacked Walpole or Carteret or Murray or Newcastle for reasons which did not seem to him convincing at the time is a proposition against which the whole course of his life cries out. In his attacks on the first two statesmen he showed that he was far more concerned with their secretive methods of carrying out their policies than with the details of their schemes. In the case of Walpole, Pitt saw that the approval given in Parliament to measures of foreign policy in no way represented the sense of the people and was only obtained, as he suspected, by underhand means. Again, the gravamen of his charge against Carteret was that his policy, whether good or bad, was conducted behind the backs of the English Parliament and people in agreement with the King's

Hanoverian ministers. In neither case was the country carried with him by the minister, an indispensable condition in Pitt's eyes for a national and a successful policy. He showed when he was himself in power that his objection to Continental measures had depended entirely on the strategic theory underlying them. If they were treated as auxiliary to the attainment of purely British objects they were admirable, but as long as they formed, or even seemed to form, an object in themselves he was determined to have nothing to do with them. As for his tributes to Walpole and Carteret in later life, it is surely a perversion of ingenuity to treat them as proofs of previous insincerity. As Horace Walpole himself noted with a characteristic sneer, his admissions of youthful mistakes were perfectly gratuitous and spontaneous, very different from what would have been the attitude of a man who had pursued a course of factious opposition. Indeed, it is obvious that while Pitt saw cause to revise his estimate of their measures, he would always have condemned Walpole's and Carteret's methods with unabated vigour. His very confessions of error prove his transparent sincerity and his desire to carry the people with him in all he did, rather than gain a reputation for consistency by misleading them.

One reason for the accusation of insincerity made against him is the mystery with which he willingly surrounded himself. Much of his correspondence, as Lord Rosebery justly remarks, is the despair of anybody really wishing to understand him, though even in that respect there is some exaggeration, for to the end on matters which concerned him deeply and on which his decision was clear his letters are direct and lucid. Still there is some justice in the complaint that save for the letters to Ann and a few others it is difficult to discover the real Chatham in his correspondence. No doubt his long experience of disappointment and his solitariness among his political associates accounts to a great extent for his fear of laying bare his heart when the reflection incidental to letter-writing as contrasted with speech was called into play; it became, indeed, almost a second nature with him to weigh each word and adopt an attitude when writing even to the dearest correspondents. Yet how true and tender he could be as a brother is clear from these letters to Ann, as a husband and father from the devotion to him of wife and children, and as a friend from some of his early letters to George Grenville, from Lyttelton's declaration that Pitt's care alone saved him from being utterly unmanned by his first wife's death, and from the enduring affection lavished on him by the friends of his youth and those of later years, like Barré.

But the real Chatham is to be found in his speeches rather than his letters. Curiously involved and mysterious as he became increasingly in all but his most intimate personal relations, he ever carried frankness almost to excess in all his dealings with the nation. When he spoke he could not conceal a thought in his mind, a characteristic well illustrated by a story told by Shelburne. He was once driving in his coach with Lord Chatham to the House of Lords, and on the way Lord Chatham confided a State secret to him. On leaving the coach at Westminster Shelburne asked him if he was going to speak that night. 'No,' said Lord Chatham, 'I dare not; for 'if I did I could not prevent myself blurting out that secret.' Chatham, indeed, was never so much at home, never so much his real self, as when speaking or acting for the English people over whom his great spirit brooded with a parent's love and pride. In his despatches as Secretary, in his speeches in the national crisis of 1755 and 1756, or during the American rebellion, Chatham appears not only greatest but most truly his natural self.

Devotion to the public such as Chatham's, in spite of its consolations and triumphs, entails much sacrifice of personal happiness. As individuals the Pitts were a tragic family. The old Governor at odds with his wife and children; his son Robert a weak, embittered man; and his most famous children, William and Ann, lonely and unsatisfied for many years. Pathetic is Ann's letter to her brother defending her acceptance of a pension, 'very essential to the ease and comfort of the 'remainder of a life which has not hitherto been very happy.' More pathetic still, when we remember the writer and what he was to become, are two letters of William, then a man nearer fifty than forty, to the Duke of Newcastle. 'I will venture 'to appeal,' he says in one, 'to your Grace's candour and 'justice whether upon such feeble pretensions as twenty years' 'use of Parliament may have given me, I have not some cause 'to feel (as I do most deeply) so many repeated and visible 'humiliations.' In the other he writes, 'very few have been 'the advantages and honours of my life . . . and [I] hope that 'some retreat, neither disagreeable nor dishonourable, may ' (when practicable) be opened to me.' After that he had his great period of glorious consciousness that the country he loved had realised her unity and her strength under his own guidance. But this joy was short-lived. A period succeeded of turmoil, of corruption and of incompetence such as has rarely been equalled in our annals. Chatham had spent most of his strength; and though his speeches of that period were a consolation to true patriots at the time, and have been an inspiration

to later generations, he himself died protesting against a dismemberment of the Empire which he had done so much to build up and feeling that the tragedy was then almost irrevocable. It is an irony of fate that the two statesmen, Chatham and Pitt, the father and son, who felt more keenly than any others England's Imperial mission should have died, one on the eve of our loss of America, the other with the sorrowful words on his lips, 'Roll up the map of Europe.' Both of them builded better than they knew, but that does not detract from the pathos of their end.

Lord Rosebery's torso, we have attempted to show, is, like everything he touches, most interesting. We do not, however, believe that it proves a complete life to be impossible. By his new material and by his finished judgements on Chatham's contemporaries he will have lightened the task for any writer daring enough to undertake it. He has helped to modify some of the excessive admiration which Burke, followed by Macaulay, has taught us to feel for almost all eighteenth-century politicians who called themselves Whigs. His picture of Chatham himself, if it had no other merit, would be valuable for rescuing his memory from the travesty of his motives promulgated by Dr. von Ruville, and bringing it back to Macaulay's saner estimate. We have, however, given reasons for believing that even for a torso this sketch is inadequate. In some respects it reminds us more of *disjecta membra* than of anything so compact as a body. Perhaps the fault lies chiefly in the tendency to treat Chatham too much as the orator who made speeches on various subjects, too little as the consistent statesman who used that supreme gift simply as a handmaiden in compassing objects far more dear to him and significant for the world. As Carlyle says, 'It is a kind of epoch in your studies of modern English History, when you get to understand of Pitt's speeches, that they are not Parliamentary eloquencies, but things which with his whole soul he means and is intent to do.'

Above all Lord Rosebery, with all his eye for effect, does not realise his opportunity in breaking off just on the threshold of great events. He does not arouse the feeling which he justly might, of awed expectation before the vision of a great people awakening from its lethargy, breaking off the chains of incompetence, and following the man with the eye to see and the hand to guide, or before that even greater vision of the great conqueror dismissed from the service of King and people, yet not embittered, but coming back with his mighty voice to awaken the conscience of a nation.

ART. II.—THE ORIGIN OF LAND-PLANTS.

1. *The Origin of a Land Flora.* By F. O. BOWER, Sc.D., F.R.S.
London: Macmillan and Co. 1908.
2. *The Structure and Development of Mosses and Ferns (Archegonialae).* By DOUGLAS HOUGHTON CAMPBELL, Ph.D. New
York: The Macmillan Co. 1905.
3. *A History of Botany, 1860–1900.* By J. REYNOLDS GREEN,
Sc.D., F.R.S., F.L.S. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
1909.
4. *Lectures on the Evolution of Plants.* By DOUGLAS HOUGHTON
CAMPBELL, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1899.
5. *A Text-Book of Botany.* By DR. EDUARD STRASBURGER
and others. Third English Edition revised by W. H. LANG,
M.B., D.Sc. London: Macmillan and Co. 1908.
6. *Ancient Plants.* By MARIE C. STOPES, D.Sc., Ph.D., F.L.S.
London: Blackie and Son. 1910.
7. *Studies in Fossil Botany.* By D. H. SCOTT, LL.D., Ph.D.,
F.R.S., &c. 2 vols. 2nd Edition. London: A. and C.
Black. 1908–1909.
8. *Fossil Plants.* By A. C. SEWARD, M.A., F.R.S. 2 vols.
Cambridge: At the University Press. 1898–1910.

It is often easiest to explain abstruse questions of biology by taking concrete examples. If we announced that we proposed to discuss the antithetic and homologous theories of the alternation of generations in plants, the reader might go no further. But if we invite him to follow the life-history of a common fern, it appears to be a matter which anyone can understand. It has, moreover, a direct bearing on the origin of land-plants. Everyone is familiar with the common Shield Fern (*Nephrodium Filix-mas*, Rich.), which grows in woods and hedgerows. It has an ample root-system, a short stem, and numerous leaves. Within the stem there is a skeleton of vascular strands which ramify and extend into the leaves and roots. Such a fern is obviously a plant capable of leading an independent life on dry land. It is able to nourish itself, by taking up from the soil the water and salts which it requires, and to elaborate from them, and from the carbon-dioxide of

the air, fresh supplies of organic food. It can resist as much drought as any ordinary terrestrial plant. Although it lives for many years, some provision must be made for the maintenance of the race. On the backs of some of the leaves will be found roundish patches filled with numerous brown spores. They are not seeds because they do not contain an embryo or young plant. A strong fern plant, in a single season, will produce fifty million spores. Of these few only of the fittest survive. But each spore is capable of acting as the starting-point of a new individual. In a dry period the spores are scattered broadcast. Indeed, a certain degree of drought is necessary for the last phase of spore production, the scattering of the living germs.

Now comes the most notable point in the life-history of the fern. When a spore falls on moist earth and germinates, there grows out of it, not a fern-plant, but a small, green, flat, heart-shaped scale. This is called the *prothallus*, and it is plainly less adapted than the fern-plant to life on exposed land. It shrivels easily in dry weather and is more immediately dependent on moisture. The prothallus bears on its lower surface sexual organs, male and female. They are placed so as to be exposed to moist air. And, indeed, fluid water is necessary for the completion of their function. In nature a shower of rain supplies what is wanted. The male and female organs open. The male cell moves freely in the water, swimming by means of active cilia, and fuses with the passive egg-cell. Thus the presence of external fluid water is essential for the process of fertilisation: without it the prothallus is unable to achieve the object of its existence.

Out of the fertilised egg-cell a small fern-plant with root, stem, and leaf emerges. The prothallus rots away and the young plant becomes independent. It gradually attains mature characters like those of the parent Shield Fern. Thus the life-cycle is completed. The two notable points are those where a new individual is represented by a single cell: in the first case by the spore; in the second case by the fertilised egg-cell. Between these two landmarks there intervene two alternating generations—the one sexual, which is the prothallus; the other non-sexual, which is the fern-plant. The first reproduces itself by sexual cells or gametes and is called the *gametophyte* generation. The second reproduces itself by non-sexual cells or spores and is called the *sporophyte* generation. The whole life-cycle of the fern may be called amphibious, since the one phase is dependent on external fluid water for propagation whilst the other phase is independent of water and is in fact adapted to

dryness. This alternation has its parallel in other plants, even the highest. But there are, as we shall see, great differences between the relative sizes and importance of the two generations, the gametophyte and the sporophyte.

It is necessary now to go back for a moment to plants lower in the scale than ferns. The problems presented by a study of the origin of plant-life had long occupied the attention of botanists. But the nature of the problem and the aspect from which it was approached were altered by the labours of two great investigators. Darwin gave the world a reasonable theory of the mode by which new species of plants and animals had originated. It is needless to dwell on the revolution in botanic thought which has followed the universal acceptance of evolution. Hofmeister established the existence of a uniform plan clearly running through the vegetable kingdom; and he broke down what had hitherto been considered the fundamental difference between Phanerogams, or flowering plants, and Cryptogams, or flowerless plants. Hofmeister, who was Professor of Botany at Heidelberg and Tübingen, gave to the scientific world a life-history of certain liverworts, mosses, ferns, and a few higher plants. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the new aspect which his book opened out.* He dealt specially with the mysterious life-cycle in the lower plants already known as the alternation of generations. Later work has shown that the unity of plan which he pointed out goes even further than he taught. There is an alternation of generations in the highest flowering plants. The facts which Hofmeister observed were only intelligible if one believed in some theory of descent. Eight years later Darwin published his carefully thought-out conclusions. Both Hofmeister and Darwin struck heavy blows at the dogma of the constancy of species.

A little before Darwin and Hofmeister published their respective works, the researches of many botanists and zoologists proceeding on different lines were establishing the cell theory. The cell became recognised as the unit of construction of animals and plants. The fact that living organisms are composed of cells is one of the most fundamental discoveries of biology. It is therefore impossible to understand modern botanical researches without some elementary notions about plant-cells. A cell in botanic parlance does not mean a hollow space enclosed by walls: but, on the contrary, the mass of living

* 'Vergleichende Untersuchungen der Keimung Entfaltung und Fruchtbildung höherer Kryptogamen und der Samenbildung der Coniferen' was published in 1851.

substance which is usually, but not necessarily, bounded by the cell walls. It is essential to grasp this clearly. When our host asks us at dinner whether we can manage another 'bottle,' he is referring to the contents. So the 'cell' is constituted by the unit of protoplasm which is contained within the cell-walls. The structure of cells is exceedingly complicated and minute. It will be enough to say that a living cell consists of a mass of protoplasm containing a *nucleus*. There is the groundwork, or cytoplasm, and within it an extremely important complicated body, known as the nucleus. It was recognised by Hugo von Mohl, a German botanist, as long ago as 1835, that no new cell could arise except from an existing cell by division. *Omnis cellula e cellula* is a familiar phrase. Plants either consist of a single cell or of an aggregate of united cells. In the latter case the members of the cell-colony have a common origin; for they have all sprung by division and re-division from the fertilised ovum or egg-cell. Strasburger, a famous German botanist, discovered (1875) not only that the nucleus is a permanent part of the cell but that certain definite constituents of it are transmitted in unbroken sequence from one cell-generation to another. When an ordinary vegetative cell divides, certain microscopic rod-like bodies are formed in the nucleus. They have been given the name of *chromosomes*. The number of chromosomes varies in the cells of plants of different species; but it is always an even number and generally constant in the same species. The chromosomes split longitudinally and forces are set up in the cell which send one half of each original chromosome to each pole of the cell. A new cell-wall is formed across the centre, dividing the mother-cell into two daughter-cells. Each daughter-cell has, therefore, the same number of chromosomes as the mother-cell had; and the substance of which they were composed has been equally divided between the two new cells. Each of the daughter-cells grows to the size of the parent cell and we have two cells instead of one. This ordinary cell division is constantly taking place in the growing parts of plants. The reproductive cells of plants called spores are produced by divisions which differ from those described above in which each daughter-cell has the same number of chromosomes as the mother-cell. In the spores the number of chromosomes is reduced to one half; and certain features present themselves which are absent in the ordinary cell-division. When the nucleus divides in such a fashion as to halve the number of chromosomes, a reducing-division is said to take place.

We have already seen how in a fern the spore produces

indirectly, and by means of the prothallus bearing sexual organs, the two gametes, male and female. Something similar happens in other plants besides ferns, and in all cases the gametes, or sexual cells, have the same number of chromosomes as the spore. The reason for reducing the number of chromosomes is apparent if we remember that the essential feature of fertilisation is the fusion of the two nuclei of the two sexual cells. Unless this reduction in number took place before the fusion the number of chromosomes would be doubled at each generation. The importance of understanding that certain plant cells called spores have half the full number of chromosomes will be plain when we return to the alternation of sexual and sexless generations which is such a peculiar feature of plant life.

A vast literature has grown up dealing with cytology or the science of cells. Botanic research now revolves round it and the ultimate solution of the most abstruse problems of life depends on it. Everyone is aware that many of the lowest plants are unicellular or consist of only one cell. The green colour of stagnant water, the green stains on damp palings and walls, are plants of this nature. They are Algae, and consist of a cell-wall, a mass of cytoplasm and a nucleus. The pigment is the same green chlorophyll which we see in the highest plants. Such a one-celled plant performs all the functions of life and feeds, grows, and reproduces itself. The single cell is at once vegetative and reproductive. It absorbs food in solution. By virtue of the chlorophyll it can in the presence of light decompose carbon-dioxide and manufacture the chemical compounds which are necessary to life. The chemistry of chlorophyll is little understood; but so far as is known, the power to manufacture these carbon compounds is confined to cells which contain chlorophyll. Finally, by division, the cell gives rise to two new ones, each an independent plant. Such a living and assimilating cell performs therefore the various vital functions of a green plant. All the different cells of a higher plant which have been evolved in the course of generations compose a more substantial but not a more wonderful organism. The investigator who seeks to discover how such a one-celled plant can ever have come into being finds the mystery still concealed by an impenetrable curtain. There is no reason why the riddle should always remain unsolved, but at present current theory among most botanists starts the genealogical tree from the group of primitive plants called Green Algae or *Chlorophyceae*.

Perhaps the most momentous step in the evolution of living organisms is that which divides the unicellular from the multicellular plant. The cell divides but the daughter-cells do not

separate, and so the most highly organised plant becomes possible. This is seen among the Green Algae where the cells are often joined end to end in filaments. Everyone is acquainted with these humble plants which wave like green hairs in the water. Among the lower Green Algae the differentiation of cells is not very great. A good many multicellular forms have all their cells the same in structure and function and are spoken of as physiologically unicellular.

In the higher forms of Algae there is, however, differentiation in two directions. First the cells which attach the plant to a substratum contain less chlorophyll and take a peculiar form. In this way a rudimentary fixing organ is formed. Secondly there is a differentiation between the supporting axis and the appendages. The cells of the axis contain less chlorophyll and become stouter. It is perhaps needless to point out the likeness to root, stem, and leaf in the higher plants. The simplest organism must adapt itself to the needs of its environment, and the division of physiological labour by slow degrees produces more complex organisation.

The Green Algae are for the most part fresh-water plants. They are, as a whole, of very simple structure; but it is amongst them that one must look for the ancestors of the lowest green land-plants, the Liverworts. There is reason for thinking that these originated from aquatic plants allied to certain existing Green Algae. The most striking fact when one compares these simple plants with the higher forms is the more and more marked specialisation of parts to fit them for special functions. At a very early stage among the lower plants one finds a modification of certain cells for reproductive purposes. In the earliest phases these reproductive cells are hardly to be distinguished from vegetative ones. Later they become extremely modified and can only serve for reproduction. The plant reproduces itself sexually when two sorts of cells are formed neither of which can develop further except as the result of a union of the two. It is probable that the stimulus required to produce development is a chemical one. Among the Green Algae, sexual as well as asexual reproduction may be clearly distinguished. When such plants are asexually reproduced a specialised cell is formed which is endowed with the power of growing into a new structure. These cells are capable of some endurance and correspond with the familiar brown spores on the back of a fern-leaf. In sexual reproduction, the plant also forms a specialised cell, but this is the result of the union of two other cells. These cells, as we have already seen, are called gametes. Among the lower plants the two gametes are frequently similar in

appearance. But as we go up in the scale a female gamete or egg-cell is distinguishable under the microscope from a smaller and more active male cell, which consists possibly of nothing more than a nucleus. When gametes, or sexual cells, are formed in Green Algae the male is provided with cilia or motile hairs with which it swims through the water until the two meet and fuse.

It is of the greatest importance to understand the difference between sexual and non-sexual reproductive cells, because in the life-history of all plants higher than the Green Algae we find alternating phases or generations. The one produces asexually formed reproductive cells and is called, as the reader doubtless remembers, the sporophyte or spore-bearing plant; the other produces sexually formed cells and is called the gametophyte or gamete-bearing plant. We have seen this in the ferns. Among the Green Algae the sexual, or gametophyte phase, and the asexual, or sporophyte phase, may be distinguished, but the two forms do not succeed one another in clearly alternating generations. This alternation of generations is believed, as we shall see, to be connected with the change from aquatic surroundings to life on dry land.

The vegetative as well as the reproductive cells of plants are, also, found to be differentiated as we pass from the lower to the higher forms. While in the unicellular plant the same cell serves to perform all functions, in the higher plants special organs are developed for special purposes. Not only is the plant-body multicellular, but the cells show great variety of form and structure. Tissues of different kinds are produced out of which special organs are formed. There is a subterranean root system for fixing the plant and supplying it with liquid nourishment. The green assimilative tissue is mainly confined to the leaves, which are organs for extracting carbon from the carbon dioxide of the atmosphere. The highest specialisation is reached in the flowers of seed-bearing plants. The elaborate machinery by which pollen is dusted on a bee and so transferred to other flowers is known to everyone.

The origin of species by descent with modification is now universally accepted by botanists. Overwhelming evidence shows that all the various kinds of plant have been produced from predecessors which differ from them comparatively slightly in the later stages of time. But these predecessors become simpler and less like their descendants as we go further back. So we reach the simplest plants. Since it is believed that Liverworts, Mosses and all the higher vascular plants are descended from algal ancestry, it is natural to suppose that

long before the luxuriant plant growth of the Carboniferous period there must have existed an age of Algae. Fossil Algae are found, but they have added little to our knowledge so far, and many remains have been described as Algae on very inadequate evidence. It is not surprising that they are not better preserved as fossils if we remember how delicate and destructible their cellular tissue generally is. With higher plants, and especially with ferns, horse-tails, club-mosses and cycads it is a very different matter. The discoveries which fossil botanists have made during the last dozen years have altered the whole aspect of the subject. In many fossil plants the cells themselves are petrified. Sections can be prepared for the microscope which show in a wonderful fashion details of the cell-wall and even the existence of the nucleus. The student of evolution finds his knowledge enormously added to by a study of fossil plants, and paleobotany is still almost in its infancy. Unfortunately most that has been written on this subject is unintelligible to the untrained botanist. 'Ancient Plants,' by Dr. Marie Stopes, gives a fairly simple account of the subject, and it is abreast of modern discoveries. It may be recommended to the general reader whose interest in science is sufficiently ardent to make him master a good many alarming botanic terms when their meaning has been explained. Professor Campbell's 'Lectures on the Evolution of Plants' is an American work written in an untechnical manner from which the general reader may learn much that will be interesting. It is clearly worded, fairly well illustrated and scientifically arranged, but unfortunately parts are now antiquated and the book is consequently occasionally untrustworthy. It is nevertheless well worth reading. The remaining works which we have placed at the head of this article are written for serious students and specialists.

We pass now from the Algae, which are aquatic. The first group of mainly terrestrial plants at once shows tissue differentiation in response to the conditions of life on land. Yet the lowest Liverworts have an extremely simple vegetative structure. It is little more advanced than that found in some of the higher Green Algae. But before going further it may be well to remind the reader, who is perhaps not familiar with classification, of the main groups into which plants are divided by botanists. It is unfortunately impossible to follow anything that has been written on the evolution of plant life without understanding the chief distinctions between Thallophytes, Bryophytes, Pteridophytes, and Spermatophytes.

It may be convenient for readers who are not botanists to have

before them in tabular form the names of the chief groups of plants.*

The *Thallophytes* are the lowest or simplest plants and comprise, besides the *Algae*, two other groups which need not trouble us further in considering the origin of land-plants. These two other groups are the *Bacteria* and the *Fungi*. Neither of them shows ancestral affinity with the higher green plants. The fungi are thought to be the degenerate descendants of green ancestors. They are all parasites or saprophytes, which feed on living or dead organic bodies respectively, and are themselves destitute of chlorophyll. The *Algae*, on the other hand, all contain chlorophyll. Many seaweeds are highly specialised and of great size, but there is no evidence that they have given rise to any higher types of plant structure.

The *Bryophytes* comprise the *Liverworts* and *Mosses*. They are terrestrial but moisture-loving forms, though many can be completely dried up and revive without injury. In all of them there is a regular alternation of generations. The liverwort-plant and moss-plant, with which everyone is familiar, is the gametophyte, or generation with sexual organs, producing gametes. The fusion of the gametes produces a sporophyte which remains attached to the parent plant and produces spores. But so far the gametophyte is the conspicuous generation.

The *Pteridophytes* include *Ferns*, *Horse-tails* and *Club-mosses* in all of which the two generations, sporophyte and gametophyte, are clearly distinguished. But here for the first time the sporophyte is the more conspicuous. The fern-plant with which everyone is familiar bears spores on the back of its leaves. When these fall to the ground and germinate the gametophyte is produced bearing sexual organs producing gametes. It is, as we have seen, small and insignificant, and when the gametes have

* Cryptogams	1. <i>Thallophytes</i> (algae, bacteria and fungi)	} Archegoniates
	2. <i>Bryophytes</i> (liverworts and mosses)	
	3. <i>Pteridophytes</i> (ferns, horse-tails, and club-mosses = vascular cryptogams)	
Phanerogams	4. <i>Spermophytes</i>	<i>Gymnosperms</i> (conifers and cycads)
		<i>Angiosperms</i> 1. Monocotyledons
		2. Dicotyledons

fused it withers and the sporophyte flourishes quite independently of the gametophyte. So the cycle of life proceeds. It is very significant that throughout the Liverworts, Mosses, Ferns, Horse-tails, and Club-mosses water should be essential to the gametophyte or sexual generation for fertilisation. Water is needed for swelling and opening the sexual organs, and the liberated male-cells then swim in the water to fuse with the egg-cell. At this stage the gametophyte becomes in effect an aquatic plant and seems to revert to the condition of its aquatic ancestors.

The Spermatophytes are the seed-bearing plants. Some of them are also called flowering plants, but the essential point about them is the seed which follows upon the flower. In this group there is also an alternation of sexless and sexual generations. As in the Pteridophytes, the sporophyte is the conspicuous generation. It is the sporophyte which we see in all seed-bearing plants, such as the pine-tree, the humble daisy, or the massive oak. The gametophyte is so inconspicuous and so deeply imbedded in the tissues of the sporophyte that its existence is ignored by the ordinary person. It will be easier to explain this in greater detail later. For the moment it is enough to remember that even in the highest plants there is an alternation of generations, though the gametophyte is almost suppressed. The sporophyte produces spores which grow into the gametophyte. So, as we have said of the other groups of plants, the cycle of life proceeds.

It is important before going further to bear in mind the essential distinction between spores and seeds. A spore is a unicellular body formed asexually and set free from the parent plant for the purposes of reproduction. It produces a gametophyte. A seed is a multicellular body, the important part of which is formed sexually by the fusion of gametes. It is not set free from the parent plant until an embryo, or young plant, has developed within it. When it germinates it produces a sporophyte. The Spermatophytes, or seed-bearing plants, fall into two divisions, Gymnosperms and Angiosperms. The Gymnosperms have naked seeds and include the Conifers and the Cycads. The Angiosperms have seeds in a closed seed-case and include all the flowering plants with which we are most familiar. But although the two divisions have the habit of seed-bearing in common, recent research has proved that the Gymnosperms are separated by a greater gulf from Angiosperms than they are from ferns and other Pteridophytes. One of the triumphs of palaeobotanists has been the discovery of an intermediate fossil group of seed-bearing ferns.

It appears from what has just been said that in the progress of plant-form upwards the relative importance of the sexual and the sexless generations has been reversed. In the Algae, though there is no regular alternation, the gametophyte or sexual form is on the whole the more conspicuous and important. In the Algae and other Thallophytes the plant body is called a *thallus* and is not differentiated into root, stem, and leaf. It is true that in the large seaweeds the plant-body is divided into parts which seem to correspond with those organs in the higher plants. But, though the different structures in the seaweeds perform the same functions, they have not the same origin or internal structure as the roots, stems, and leaves of a fern or a buttercup. In the Bryophytes the plant body is still thalloid in the lower Liverworts; but in the higher Mosses it is plainly composed of stem and leaves. Everyone has seen the gametophyte generation, for it is what was meant when we speak of a liverwort or moss and it is the conspicuous generation. But few have noticed the sporophyte generation in Liverworts. It is more easily seen in Mosses. In these plants the sporophyte (frequently consisting of a foot, a stalk, and a capsule) is fixed on the gametophyte moss-plant. It looks, in fact, much like a fruit. It is dependent on the gametophyte moss-plant for water and food. It is not, however, wholly parasitic, for it contains chlorophyll and has the power of using the carbon dioxide of the air. In the Mosses and Liverworts the sexual generation or gametophyte reaches its climax, but Mosses and Liverworts are notoriously dependent on damp. The simplicity of their tissues very imperfectly enables them to survive the dangers of growth on land during a drought.

When we reach the Pteridophytes the balance is reversed, and the gametophyte or sexual generation has become degraded. The prothallus of a fern has become only a temporary phase in the cycle of life. The old predominant partner is now completely eclipsed in the life cycle. The sporophyte or sexless generation has risen in the world. In the Mosses it was short-lived and dependent. In all the Pteridophytes, which means all ferns, horsetails, and club-mosses, it has become a strong self-supporting plant. The spores are produced after long vegetative growth. The plants are frequently perennial, and spore production continues for an unlimited number of seasons. The sporophyte which sprang from small beginnings remains the dominant generation in all the higher land-plants. This inversion in the importance of the two generations is one of the most striking facts in the whole history of plants. What is the explanation?

It is believed by most botanists that Liverworts, or at any

rate the primitive land-plants, sprang from green aquatic forms which lived in shallow fresh water or in the sea between high and low tide marks. There are many Green Algae which do so now. When the plants produced gametes, fertilisation was easy because the motile male cell could swim to the egg-cell through the water. It could also be carried out at any time. Some of these plants, possibly to escape competition, spread to the land. Fertilisation at once became more uncertain and difficult, for access to water was an occasional occurrence. Sexual reproduction could only take place in flood, or rain, or heavy dew, and then only at the moment when the sexual organs were mature. So an alternative safer method of reproduction had to be evolved, and spores and the sporophyte were slowly adapted to aerial conditions. The rise and progress of the sporophyte appears to be a natural outcome of the migration of plants from water to land. It would lead into too technical matters if we attempted to describe how theoretically this may have taken place. Professor Bower believes in the sterilisation of potential sporogenous tissue.

We have so far avoided as carefully as possible any controversial questions. But botanists are widely divided as to the way in which the sporophyte was produced. Are the two generations homologous or are they antithetic? It will be enough to explain the nature of the controversy without inviting the reader who is not a botanist to take sides and join in the fray. Some believe that the primitive aquatic sexual plant—in fact the gametophyte—became modified and suited to aerial conditions. In such a case the two generations would have had the same origin and would be homologous. But others hold that the fertilised egg-cell was elaborated to suit life on land, and that a new phase of plant-life was interpolated between two sexual generations. In this case the two generations would be antithetic.

Supporters of the antithetic theory maintain that the origin of the spore-producing plant must be looked for in the gradual development of sterile tissue in the generation arising from the fertilised egg-cell. As a consequence spore-formation has been delayed and the spore-producing plant has become longer-lived and more important. Professor Bower, in the masterly work which he has published on 'The Origin of a Land Flora,' has put together an exhaustive and closely reasoned argument in favour of the antithetic theory. He has, however, somewhat modified since then the views he expresses. There is no doubt that the tendency of modern thought among botanists is towards the homologous theory. But the text-books still expound to

students antithetic views. Some few years ago the notion of an homologous or similar origin of sexual and non-sexual generations would have been scouted by orthodox botanists, as Dr. Scott pointed out in his Presidential Address to the Linnean Society in 1910. The old antithetic theory set up an impassable barrier between the two generations. It also shut off the vascular plants—that is, the Pteridophytes and all above them—absolutely from everything below them. The sporophyte, the plant itself, was assumed to be a new intercalation in the life-history, and could therefore never be compared to the plant in the Thallophytes, which was supposed to belong to the other or sexual generation. Now a very important discovery has been made, which has opened a new view. An Alga (*Dictyota*) has given the clue; for it shows how the two alternating generations, the sexual and the asexual, may be exactly alike and homologous with each other in all their parts in cases where they are exposed to like conditions. Thus the idea has gained ground that the sporophyte, or spore-bearing plant, like the gametophyte, or prothallus, may itself be a modified thallus. The whole field of comparison between the Thallophytes and the higher plants is once more opened up. To students of fossil plants this is especially interesting, for there is a possibility of tracing root, stem, and leaf a few steps nearer their ultimate origin.

One further matter must be mentioned. In describing the way in which plant-cells divide we saw that the matter of which the chromosomes—that is the rod-like bodies formed in the nucleus—were composed was equally divided between the daughter-cells. This is so until the spores are formed. The number of chromosomes is always constant until what is called the reducing division, before the formation of spores, takes place. Then the number of chromosomes is halved. If there are sixteen in the spore-bearing plant, there will be eight in the spore and in the gametophyte which grows from it. The full number of sixteen will not be found again until the sexual gametes fuse. The chromosomes do not fuse, and are doubled in number by such an act of fertilisation. It would seem, then, that the sporophyte generation must have double the number of chromosomes which the gametophyte possesses. Is this so in the leafy fern-plant and the little green prothallus? A vast amount of microscopic investigation has been done on plants of all classes within the last few years to see how far this holds good. It has been found that in normal cases this wide-sweeping generalisation is correct. The fact is important; but it would lead into too technical and difficult matters if we tried to trace its bearing on the theories of alternation.

Two extremely important steps in the developement of the typical land-plant must now be noticed. They are, in the first place, the appearance of vascular tissue, and, in the second, what is known as heterosporry. The internal structure of the higher plants varies in marked fashion according to the places which they inhabit. The amount of available water is the chief factor in the surroundings which causes these differences. If a plant is to live in the air and withstand drought, some provision must be made for the support of the stem and for the supply of water to the upper parts of the plant-body. The lowest land-plants, the Liverworts, are recumbent. The Mosses grow in patches and support one another. Both are very dependent upon external damp. Their tissues are spoken of as cellular, and they make but poor provision for internal water supplies. The lowest Pteridophyte, whether fern, horse-tail or club-moss, shows a complexity far exceeding that of the highest Moss. The sporophyte or land generation has now developed the so-called vascular tissues which are found in all the higher plants. They are long strings of tissue which run upwards through the stem. The cells which compose the tissue are exceptionally long and they have thickened walls. They are, in fact, water-pipes. It is these vascular bundles which carry water and liquid nourishment up and down the stem. Anyone who will put the stem of a plant into a bottle of red ink and in a few hours cut a section some inches from the bottom of the stem can see the vascular bundles. The strands are coloured red by the ink which has passed up them, whilst the rest of the tissues are almost colourless. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the importance which the evolution of vascular tissue has had in the developement of land-plants. It is only by means of this that the tall and massive vegetation which now covers the earth has become possible. To compare vegetable with human life, one might say that only the invention of hot and cold water supplies with taps on every floor made possible the life in the New York sky-scraper of twenty-five stories. As long as the water supply had to be drawn from a well or pond, mankind had to be content to live in dwellings of one or at most two floors. The enormous size and the long life of some of the Gymnosperms and Angiosperms compared with a Liverwort or a Moss are the most striking facts in the developement of a land-flora. Large numbers of these water-pipe cells closely packed together with some hard cells between them make up the wood in a woody stem. It is in the Pteridophytes or ferns that we first encounter the peculiar tissue characteristic of the vascular plants. It is worth noting also that

in the same group the sporophyte, or spore-bearing land-plant, becomes for the first time the conspicuous and important generation.

We have already mentioned what is called by botanists heterospory. Let us explain it. Yet another momentous step in the direction of the higher plants is taken when spores of two kinds are produced. In all the Bryophytes, and in many Pteridophytes, the spores are all alike and all equally small. But in some Pteridophytes (and in all Spermatophytes or seed plants, as we shall see) two very different types of spore are produced. There is a small spore which produces a prothallus with a male organ and male cells. There is a large spore which produces a prothallus with a female organ and egg-cells. These two sorts of spores are borne in different spore cases and this state of things exists in certain club-mosses. But when the large spores and the small spores germinate, the prothallus, or gametophyte generation, which they produce is exceedingly small. In extreme cases it is reduced to a few microscopic cells. Yet if fertilisation is to take place the gametes which each prothallus produces must meet and fuse. The difficulty is that the sexual cells are produced on separate prothalli. Hence it has come about that the higher plants have become dependent upon the wind or insects to carry the small spores into close proximity with the large spores. In flowering plants (Gymnosperms and Angiosperms) the small spores are the pollen-grains produced by the anthers and the large spores are the so-called embryo-sacs produced by the ovules. Pollen-grains and embryo-sacs both germinate and produce microscopic prothalli. They are reduced to nothing compared with the prothallus or sexual generation of the fern. Still more insignificant are these gametophytes compared with the liverwort and moss-plant. Yet it is these prothalli which produce the sexual cells of the highest plants. In the flowering plants the female prothallus is imbedded in the tissues of the sporophyte. It is fertilised and protected there until the young sporophyte contained in a seed is separated from the old sporophyte. It is a long story, but we have now traced the alternation of generations from the lowest land-plants to the highest.

The main scheme in the evolution of plant life now stands out clearly. The first step was from water to land. Secondly, following upon this, the aim has been to avoid the dangers of a free swimming male cell which could only perform its function with the aid of water. The reproductive organs show the place of a plant in the scale of evolution because they are much less altered by surroundings than the vegetative

organs. It is well worth understanding how the dangers which must accompany fertilisation in water have been got over. We have seen that in all plants up to and including the Pteridophytes or ferns, horse-tails, and club-mosses, water is needed. The next group above them are the seed-plants. When we say that they produce seeds we mean that the large spore is retained on the sporophyte while it completes its development into the gametophyte and even until the second sporophyte, the embryo, is so far advanced as to possess root, stem, and leaves. Yet since all seed-plants now living produce small male spores and large female spores on different leaves (which in flowering plants we call stamens and carpels), it would obviously be an advantage to do without water. Most seed-plants have accomplished this and no longer produce motile male cells. But the lower seed-plants are still dependent on water. The lowest types of seed-bearing plants now living are the Cycads, a group of palm-like plants, most of which are strictly tropical. They look in some ways like ferns. The large spores in the genus *Cycas* are borne upon what are held to be leaves, which apparently differ little from ordinary ones. The small spores, or pollen-grains, are produced in great numbers on the backs of structures which resemble the spore-bearing parts of some ferns. The pollen falls on the top of the ovule or spore-case. There it germinates and sends forth a *pollen-tube* which forces its way down to a cavity above the egg-cell. This cavity is filled with a watery fluid. Into it the male cells are discharged through the tube. The strange thing is that they are found to be furnished with motile cilia and to swim to the egg-cell. Few discoveries produced greater sensation in the botanic world. There is a yet more highly organised plant which retains this primitive aquatic character: *Gingko biloba*, the Maidenhair tree, is a living fossil, the sole species surviving of a great group that ranks equal in size and complexity with the Conifers. It is doubtful whether it any longer exists in a wild state, but gigantic trees, hundreds of years old, grow round the temples of China and Japan. The botanist may well be grateful to the superstition or the religious sentiment which has preserved him such interesting material. The microscope has disclosed that the male cell is of comparatively large size and swims actively. It is provided with a spiral of hairlike structures whose movements propel it through the water in the cavity of the unripe seed.

The Cycads and *Gingko* are both Gymnosperms, but in the higher plants of that group the male cell has become a

nucleus, no longer provided with motile organs, entirely independent of water and incapable of swimming. When the motile male cells of the Cycads were discovered (1896), the last barrier between ferns and seed-plants was broken down; and when the remains of fossil seed-bearing ferns were detected (1903), a bridge between the two great groups of higher land-plants was securely founded. The existence of a passive as opposed to an active male cell has made the higher plants dependent upon fertilisation through the transport of the pollen-grain and the growth of the pollen-tube. On land it is a much more certain process; and to this end the whole evolution of land vegetation has directed itself. Men, like plants, improve their methods. In old days partridges were taken with hawks. It was an uncertain method, dependent on weather and surroundings. The hawk often failed to strike the partridge, and was sometimes itself lost. Hawking may be compared with aquatic fertilisation. Now guns, weapons of great precision, are used, and failure to hit the bird has become comparatively rare. So with plants, what is called siphonogamic fertilisation may be likened to shooting with a well-aimed gun. But the pollen-grain has first to be transported by the wind or the insect, and it is as though the guns reached the stubble-fields by balloons or motor-cars.

With seed-bearing plants and what is called siphonogamic or pollen-tube fertilisation we have reached the top of the vegetable kingdom. The evolution of plant life has, up to the present, gone no further. We have traced in outline several well-marked steps. There is the step from the unicellular to the many-celled plant; the development of special reproductive cells; the appearance of vascular tissue which forms both a skeleton and a system of water-pipes; the production of spores of two kinds; the development of the pollen-tube; and the final disappearance of the motile aquatic male cell. All through the kingdom of plants, above the lowest group, there is the strange alternation of generations pointing back to the change from a water-flora to a land-flora. One of the most notable peculiarities of the Pteridophytes was the reduction of the gametophyte and the corresponding rise in importance of the spore-bearing plant. This culminates in the heterosporous plants, which produce spores of two kinds, destined, respectively, to produce male and female cells. In such a case the gametophyte may lack all power of independent growth and serve merely to develop the reproductive organs. In the highest of all plants, the bearers of flowers and seeds,

the matter is carried one step further, and the large spore (embryo-sac) remains permanently within the spore-case or ovule. There fertilisation takes place, and there the embryo sporophyte begins to develop. The small spores, however, even in the highest of all plants, are discharged from the spore-case, and complete their development outside, as in the Pteridophytes. These small spores are the pollen-grains, and the flower is an elaborate mechanism to secure their dispersal and obtain for the plant species the benefits of cross-fertilisation. The highest seed-plants do not differ in any essential structural points from the Pteridophytes. What we call a flower is a collection of spore-bearing leaves, carpels, and stamens. In certain cases these may be protected by a calyx; and there may be a corolla (like a more or less gaudy signboard outside an ale-house) to attract passing insects. The spore-bearing leaves are the essential part of a flower. In some Cycads it is to all appearance plain that the spores are being borne on leaves. It is not so obvious in a buttercup or a daisy.

Since the flower is to most persons the only interesting part of a plant (with the possible exception in certain cases of the fruit), it is interesting to see more exactly how flowering plants arose. There is a great difference in appearance between the cones of Gymnosperms and the brilliant flowers of Angiosperms such as the rose and the lily. Of these two groups of seed-bearing plants the Gymnosperms are the older and the more primitive. Large spores and small spores, stamens and carpels, are always borne in different flowers and often upon different plants. These naked-seeded plants are of great age, and therefore of exceptional interest to those who trace plant-life backwards to simpler forms. The Cycads and the Conifers are types which far exceed all other seed-bearing plants now living in antiquity. The Cycads are unknown to most persons; but all are familiar with monkey-puzzles, pines, cypresses, and yews. These represent the four types of living Conifers. In a sense they carry us back to the forests of the Coal Period. Yet they show no signs of decadence. In the higher latitudes of the northern hemisphere Conifers play a great part in the present-day vegetation. We do not know when the Gymnosperms began. One group was flourishing in the Coal Period. They are clearly descendants of some group of Pteridophytes. Yet, in the vegetable world, they still maintain their position of giants of the earth. Coniferous trees are the tallest in the world. This is due to the persistence of the original apical bud, which remains active unless it is accidentally destroyed by a squirrel or a storm,

so that the tree grows in height for hundreds of years. In Conifers, the small spores or pollen-grains are scattered by the fortuitous efforts of the wind. The pollen must for this reason be produced in great abundance, and the ground near the trees is sometimes covered as if by a yellow dust.

The fairly recent discovery of certain fossil remains of a group of Gymnosperms which seem to connect the palm-like Cycads with the modern buttercup has excited great interest in the botanical world. It is believed that we there see the first steps in the evolution of the flower as it now exists among the Angiosperms. *Bennettites* is considered by many as a predecessor of the Angiosperms, which supplies an explanation of the origin of the flower. The small spores and the large spores are borne in the same flower, for so one may call such a highly organised structure. The seed-bearing part is in the middle. Below are placed the stamens. Outside them are a series of expanded leafy scales which are to some eyes the incipient petals and sepals.

Angiosperms or true flowering plants are, compared with the other groups, of almost recent origin. Many are found fossil in Upper Cretaceous rocks, but beyond that the evidence is doubtful. The strange thing is that when flowering plants first appear there seems to be a sudden inrush of them. It is as though Nature had been trying to devise the model, and having once succeeded poured them out in numbers. Flowering plants therefore occupy a somewhat isolated position. They suddenly spring into prominence among fossil remains, but no quite direct connexion has been discovered between them and the older groups. A great deal of fossil material has, however, been collected dating from Cretaceous times. Leaves and stems are plentiful, and even flowers and fruits have been got from the later rocks. Already by Cretaceous times there were many different species of flowering plants; and numbers belong to genera still living, whilst others are very like existing species. The more woody plants have been best preserved, and they include species of oak, willow, poplar, fig, and magnolia. It is most noticeable that no very striking differences have been discovered between the earliest flowering plants and those now living. If we compare the existing club-mosses with those of ancient periods, noteworthy differences are obvious, but this is not so with flowering plants. There is a good deal of mystery still about the last stages of their evolution, and particularly about the sudden rush of highly organised forms which succeeded what was apparently their first appearance. Be the causes of this what they may, it is clear that

the trend of evolution had been working towards vegetation of fixed habit and adapted to life on land. The Angiosperms or flowering plants are the expression of this upward movement, and they now dominate the vegetation all over the earth. Wherever plant life is found they have established themselves. They range over every land area between the poles and the equator. They live in rivers and lakes, some in marshes and a few completely submerged. By differences of outward form and internal structure they have adapted themselves to the most varied surroundings. The reader may with profit compare for himself the vegetation of a tropical forest and an alpine rock, the plants on the marshy brink of a pond and in the arid sands of the desert. Yet they are all Angiosperms, their spores produce the reproductive cells which have all along been the subject of our chief attention. These reproductive cells now appear as the products of a vast vegetative structure through which the outcome of their fusion, the embryo, can be nourished. The young plant protected by seed-coats is then shed ready to struggle for its life. The higher Pteridophytes were overshadowed by the risk of failure at two critical moments. The large spores and the small spores might not germinate near each other. Secondly, the sexual cells, through the absence of water, might never meet. In Angiosperms the only danger to be faced is some mishap in securing pollination. To this end the special contrivances of elaborate flowers are directed, and in the most specialised plants the danger is reduced to a minimum. It is believed by some, on very slender grounds, that the earliest petals after green were yellow. That is the primitive colour of flowers. Some then became white. After that a few of them grew to be red, and at last a comparatively small number acquired shades of purple, lilac, mauve, and violet. The ultimate and most advanced colour is blue. There are sceptics who doubt how far insects are attracted and guided by colour. It has been said that beetle-flowers are most often yellow, and that bee-flowers are generally blue. To discover for what purpose the numberless forms and colours in flowers are adapted furnishes one of the most absorbing amusements in which the amateur botanist can engage.

There are, as the reader is probably aware, two very distinct groups of Angiosperms or flowering plants. A bean or an acorn is a seed that can be readily split in two, whilst such a thing cannot be done to a grain of wheat or the seed of a lily. The presence of one or two seed-leaves also, called cotyledons, has

given the names to the two great groups of flowering plants : *Dicotyledons* and *Monocotyledons*.

‘A primrose by the river’s brim
Dicotyledon was to him.’

One of the great problems of palaeobotanists at the present day is to discover for certain which is the older group, and whether one can be traced back as a descendant of the other. Monocotyledons have as a rule narrow leaves with unbranched veins. The parts of the flower are usually arranged in whorls of three. Grasses, Lilies, and Irises all belong to this group. At the top of them, as some botanists hold, are the Orchids, whose wonderful flowers contain an ingenious variety of devices by which cross-fertilisation is effected. Yet the deformed and elaborate flowers of the Orchids can all be traced back to the simpler form of a lily. In some cases it seems as though the orchid flower were adapted to pollination by a single species of insect upon which it is absolutely dependent. Such extreme specialisation may sometimes defeat itself. Orchids do not seem to have done as well in the struggle for life as they ought, for they are a large cosmopolitan order. They seldom occur in such great numbers as to affect the aspect of the vegetation. Yet their flowers in themselves are showy. Many live on other plants without being parasites. A few are saprophytes, which live on dead organic matter. These have lost their green chlorophyll and their leaves are reduced to small scales. They are the only monocotyledons which have degenerated in this fashion.

Fossil records show that the two parallel groups of flowering plants arose about the same epoch. There are reasons for thinking that dicotyledons may be more primitive in structure though not necessarily much earlier in point of time. Among them the vegetable organism which we have traced from the Green Algae reachest its highest point. At the head of the whole vegetable kingdom stands the great order *Compositae*. One-tenth of all flowering plants belong to it. In most parts of the world the sunflower and the daisy type is familiar. A mass of small flowers are crowded together in a head. The outer florets are sterile, but they make the whole conspicuous. They are sacrificed as living advertisements for the good of the community. It seems that this type of flower-head has proved singularly successful. The *Compositae* are extraordinarily prolific ; for, though they do not produce more seeds in actual numbers, each individual floret nearly always ripens its one seed. Moreover, many species, like the familiar dandelions,

are provided with the most beautiful parachutes for transporting seeds through the air to places where they can germinate and grow with the greatest success. One of the largest genera is *Senecio*, to which belong our groundsels and ragworts. It is a striking and amusing thought that among plants, the daisy, dandelion, and groundsel should have obtained the proud position which mankind has secured in the animal world.

The future progress of botany now seems to lie between the palaeobotanists and the cytologists. The former are hard at work reconstructing extinct forms of plant life from scattered fragments that have been preserved. They are able by cutting sections of petrified tissues to examine the forms of cells which lived untold ages ago. Were the geological records complete, they might hope to piece together a complete chain and follow the origins of plant life back to their beginning. All classification is now based on natural relationship and descent, but there are still many gaps that have to be bridged by ingenious guesses. The cytologists are concerned with the present. They are armed with modern microscopes and busy prying into the secrets of life, which are apparently, but perhaps not really, denuded of everything but the thinnest veil.

ART. III.—THE BRITISH ARMY AND MODERN
CONCEPTIONS OF WAR.

1. *Official History (Naval and Military) of the Russo-Japanese War.* Vol. I. (to 24th August 1904). Prepared by the Historical Section of the Committee of Imperial Defence. London: Harrison and Sons. 1910.
2. *The Russo-Japanese War.* Prepared in the Historical Section of the German General Staff. Authorised translation by Karl von Donat. London: Hugh Rees.
3. *La Guerre Russo-Japonaise.* Prepared in the Historical Section of the French General Staff and published in the 'Revue Militaire des Armées Étrangères.' No. 956. Juillet 1907 et seq.
4. *The Russian Army and the Japanese War.* By GENERAL KUROPATKIN. London: John Murray. 1909.
5. *Field Service Regulations: Part I. Operations* By the General Staff. London: Harrison and Sons. 1909.
6. *Memorandum on Army Training.* 1910.
7. *Tendencies in the German Army.* The 'Times' newspaper, January 23 and 30, February 6 and 20. 1911.
8. *Initiative and the Power of Manœuvre.* By Brigadier-General H. H. WILSON, C.B., D.S.O., Director of Military Operations. War Office. London: Hugh Rees. 1911.

I.

THE first phase of our campaign in Natal and Cape Colony presented to the world the unforeseen spectacle of a highly-trained and well-disciplined regular army, whose armament and equipment were abreast of the requirements of modern war, checked at all points by the levies of two insignificant Republics whose forces were but loose gatherings of armed farmers.

Not in England alone were there searchings of heart when, in December 1899, the news of Colenso followed hard on that of Stormberg and of Magersfontein: the soldiers of Europe, and in Continental Europe all men are soldiers, were disturbed to learn that untrained farmers had beaten well-drilled men. For a brief moment the questions were asked: 'Have regular armies lost their value? have modern weapons made untrained men who can shoot straight the equals of disciplined

'troops? is it to no purpose that the nations have submitted so long to the heavy yoke of preparation for war as conceived by their rulers?' By many it was assumed that the war in South Africa had revolutionised tactics, by some it was suggested that even in the domain of strategy we were in the presence of new conditions which would compel a readjustment of ideas formed from a study of past wars. In France General de Négrier jeopardised his brilliant reputation by supporting the critics of existing regulations, critics whose doubts and questionings were made to seem well founded by a meretricious appeal from what they stigmatised as theory to the then most recent practice of war.

The training manuals of modern armies bear a strong family likeness to one another. That the regulations under which the British Army of 1899 was drilled and trained were quite as good as those of other European armies and were carried out to the letter, we have the authority of General Langlois for believing. To what then could the soldiers of Europe ascribe our defeats? Why did our Army lose battles?

General Langlois, a student of war who has done much to mould and to develop the military thought of France in our generation, tells us that we failed because we lacked a consistent and coherent tactical and strategical education, a doctrine of war infusing with life the whole body of an army, without which the most admirable texts and precepts enshrined in regulations are but dead bones and dry dust.

'Sans doctrine, les textes ne sont rien : à des textes sans doctrine, serait de beaucoup préférable une doctrine sans textes, ce qui était le cas à l'époque napoléonienne.'*

In the study of the War in South Africa, prepared by the Historical Section of the German Great General Staff, we find the same deductions drawn: the British Army failed because its military education was unsound, in that it was not infused with the essential principles of war deduced from history, and lacked what General Langlois would call 'la doctrine.' In different words the same conclusion is reached in explanation of the defeats of our regular army by the Boer levies, for the Great General Staff tells us that:

'The leaders—superior and subordinate—had . . . no mental grasp of the requirements of a modern battle.'†

* Enseignements de deux Guerres récentes, p. 240.

† German Official Account of the War in South Africa, vol. ii. p. 331.

And again:

'The rigid fettering with forms and rules, to which a false system of peace training had condemned leaders, avenged itself bitterly during the South African War. In this experience, so pregnant of warning for the future, is contained the most important lesson of the whole war.' *

Our Army has not been the only European army to suffer, in recent years, from the lack of doctrine. In a book which purports to set forth the reasons for the defeat of the Russian Army in Manchuria, the late commander-in-chief of that unfortunate army, General Kuropatkin, reiterates time and again the divergence of views held by his subordinate commanders as to the training and handling of troops. For instance he tells us:

'Although the same drill books and manuals are used by the whole army, there is considerable variety in the way the tactical instruction is imparted, owing to the diverse views held by the district commanders.' †

And again:

'Our troops had been instructed, but what they had learned varied according to the personal idiosyncrasies of this or that district commander. The stronger the officer commanding a district, the less did he feel bound to abide by the authorised method of instruction and training laid down in the existing drill books.' ‡

Such diversity of view among commanders is a sure indication that unity of doctrine is wanting throughout an army.

Early in the war General Kuropatkin found it necessary to issue to his troops instructions which ranged over a wide field of tactics: in August, September, October, and December, 1904, these were supplemented by further instructions. No doubt the topographical conditions of the theatre of war did call for some special instructions to indicate the minor tactics best suited to dealing with conditions strange to troops trained in European Russia, nevertheless the Japanese, thoroughly imbued as they were with a coherent doctrine of war, may have smiled with grim irony if in captured Russian positions they found copies of the instructions issued by the

* German Official Account of the War in South Africa, vol. ii. p. 343.

† Kuropatkin, 'The Russian Army and the Japanese War,' vol. ii. p. 2.

‡ Ibid. p. 23.

Russian commander-in-chief in August 1904, in which the following paragraph occurs :

'The most effectual method of guarding against a sudden emergency either in attack or defence . . . is to have in hand a strong reserve, and not to make use of it too lightly. This we have not done in recent actions ; we have told off weak reserves, and used them up too quickly.'*

With this admirable precept few will be found to quarrel, but the impression remains that an army whose commander, in the intervals between defeats, finds it necessary to instil into his subordinates such well-worn maxims, is an army patently without a doctrine of war.

It is far from our intention to suggest that lack of a doctrine was the only reason for the reverses suffered by the British Army in Africa and the Russian Army in Manchuria ; we, in whose mind the evidence given before Lord Elgin's commission is still fresh, know but too well that this is not so ; still it is significant that the same lack of an all-permeating, vivifying doctrine is to be found in the army which was beaten at Mukden, and in that which failed at Colenso and at Spion Kop.

During the eight years which have passed since the peace of Vereeniging, we have not been less quick than observers on the Continent to draw lessons from the South African War. Yet among those 'lessons' reiterated by an anxious and well-intentioned Press, in this but too truly reflecting our uninformed public opinion, we seek in vain for any appreciation of the fact that a sound, comprehensive, all-pervading doctrine of war is as important to an army as its organisation, that it is the soul without which an army is but so much inert matter and that in this vital respect the British Army of 1899—like the Russian Army a few years later—was completely lacking. To learn this particular lesson we must turn to the pages of French and German critics who belong to races in the military sense educated, in that they have long been the possessors of national armies in close touch with the life of the people. It is among the first duties of the General Staff of a great modern national army to indoctrinate it with a clear conception of the basic principles of war, and of the method on which it intends to apply those principles to the conduct of national war. Hence the high level of thought and the logical trend of criticism we find in the military literature of France and Germany compared with that of England, where the General

* Kuropatkin, vol. ii. p. 16.

Staff is a plant of but recent growth, and the Army, quite divorced from the national life, is subject to much ill-considered fault-finding.

In the schemes of army reform initiated by Mr. Brodrick and by Mr. Arnold-Forster, in the frequent, sometimes startling, changes in the drill and training of troops which closely followed the South African War, are to be found traces of hasty action taken in response to the natural feeling, so widespread throughout the country, that our Army had failed and that something must be done. Mr. Haldane, more fortunate than Mr. Brodrick and Mr. Arnold-Forster, became Secretary of State for War at a time when public opinion had somewhat blunted the keen edge of its impatience in criticism of what had been accomplished under his predecessors; consequently he and his advisers were given time to evolve the scheme of reform in which we hope that we have found our military salvation. The fruits of their labours are a well-organised Regular Army, available for war anywhere, and a Territorial Army maintained for home defence only.

It has been claimed on behalf of this, the third re-organisation of our Army since the outbreak of the South African War, that it is the last word of the Voluntary system, that it is a scientific adaptation of our available means to our required end in the question of national defence, and that it will succeed because it has not been a hasty improvisation but the result of clear thinking applied to the lessons of the South African War. If we allow these claims to be just, and they are no small claims, we must admit freely that Mr. Haldane and his advisers have indeed culled from our initial defeats and long-postponed success in the weary struggle with the Boer Republics some real lessons; which have been put to good purpose inasmuch as the mechanism of the British Army is better adjusted, it is balanced as a whole, and its parts have been assembled, not as heretofore fortuitously, but so as to enable certain definite and limited tasks to be undertaken both overseas and at home.

One question, however, remains to be answered; has our Army learnt that lesson which the German Great General Staff has recorded is in its opinion the most important lesson of the whole South African War; the lesson upon which General Langlois insists when he tells us that we owed our South African defeats to the absence of a clear, consistent and comprehensive conception of how battles are won which he calls a doctrine of war?

If we are to acquire a well-grounded confidence that the

British Army of to-day is to play a part in modern war commensurate with the hopes of the country and with the claims put forward on its behalf by its latest reformer, this question must be answered. It is a matter of moment to us to follow the process by which the thinking organ of an army, the General Staff, extracts from the records of the past and the wars of the present the principles which have governed the success and failure of great commanders; to learn how from these principles it forms a conception of war adapted to the circumstances and characteristics of the nation and army it serves; and then to note how, transmuting this conception into a doctrine permeating the whole body of the army, it leads that army to seek for victory along certain definite lines, to follow which has become instinctive to leaders and subordinates alike.

To quote General Langlois once more: 'L'étude des moyens à employer par le commandement pour répandre la doctrine serait un travail intéressant et profitable à tous.'

When the distinguished French soldier wrote these words he may well have felt a proud confidence that if France turns to the work done by her General Staff since the dark days of 1870, and examines the processes by which the chosen men of her army have been led to formulate what is now known as the French doctrine of war, she will realise that the quiet thinkers of the Historical Section, the soldiers who serve with brain and pen in lieu of sword and sinew, have deserved as well of their country as those who have had the good fortune to serve her on the battlefield. They have forced upon a reluctant Europe, somewhat contemptuous after Sedan, recognition of the fact that the philosophy of war is not an inalienable Teutonic possession: without a shot fired they have rehabilitated the French Army, and they have not tricked it out in clothes stolen from Berlin.

After the disasters of the Franco-German War a new army had to be fashioned in France. The old Imperial conscript army, led by brave men who did not know their trade, had gone down before a nation in arms, long prepared for the trial and guided by soldiers who, having pondered the lessons of past wars, understood one and all quite clearly how they intended to attain their object. France learned her lesson. The new army of the Third Republic raised for the purpose of national war, was based on the principle of universal service. The questions how to train it for war and how to use it in war remained to be answered. A simple solution would have been to adopt slavishly the procedure of the victorious Germans—

in a spasmodic effort to be German the British Army got just so far as to place upon the head of its long-suffering infantry of the line a helmet which is a poor relation of the Pickelhaube worn by the victors of Sedan. The solution which commended itself to the organisers of the new French Army was to take from their recent foe the institution of the General Staff, and to trust that General Staff to evolve a system of training suited to the character of the material to be trained, which was French, not Prussian. The Historical Section of the General Staff was charged with the task of seeking the reasons of French victories under Napoleon the First and of French defeats under Napoleon the Third: the result of these studies, it was hoped, would indicate how best a French Army could play its part in future wars.

The victors in the conflict of 1866 and 1870-1 ascribed their successes to the fact that the leaders of the Prussian Army in the war against Austria, and of the German Army in the war against France, had made their own the philosophy of war as expounded by Clausewitz. A recent German writer, General von Cämmerer, tells us that: 'Karl von Clausewitz, the pupil and friend of Scharnhorst and the confidant of Gneisenau, is, in Germany, generally recognised as the most prominent theorist on war, as the real philosopher on war, to whom our famous victors on the more modern battlefields owe their 'spiritual training.' *

In his introduction to the last English edition of Clausewitz, Colonel Maude reminds us that: 'It is to the spread of Clausewitz's ideas that the present state of more or less immediate readiness for war of all European armies is due. . . . '†

Of the many writers on war, his predecessors and his contemporaries, this disciple of Kant, whose philosophic mind had been deeply stirred by the tragedy of Jena and the drama of Waterloo, in both of which he had played his part, was the first to apply pure thought to the work of war; the first to formulate in words the principles which lent to Napoleonic war its power, scope, and intense energy. If Napoleon is the god of modern war, Clausewitz is his prophet. The doctrine he preached was based on the principle that the destruction of the enemy's main army is the one true goal of warlike effort, and that it is to be brought about by the application of superior force, at the decisive point, at the decisive time.

Thus stated the doctrine has received universal assent:

* Von Cämmerer, 'The Development of Strategical Science,' p. 72.

† 'On War,' by Gen. Karl von Clausewitz, vol. i. p. xi.

the question remains *how* is superior force to be most surely brought to bear at the decisive point at the decisive time? How are the available means to be employed to attain most certainly the end in view?

The German answer to the question has been weighed by the French General Staff, and considered in the light of the researches into Napoleon's methods in which the French Historical Section has been long engaged. The conclusion reached by the French is that although the object Napoleon set before himself was correctly divined by Clausewitz, his later German disciples have never fully understood the conception of war lying behind the method by which Napoleon sought to attain his object, and consequently have failed to appreciate the inherent strength of that method when applied to modern problems as it would be by the master. In the strategy leading up to the battles of 1866 and of 1870, in the grand tactics of the battles of those wars, and more especially in present-day developments of German military thought as shown in recent military literature, and as exemplified in German practice at manœuvres, and in the training of leaders and of troops, the French teachers of war profess to see an inherent element of weakness due to departure from Napoleonic methods. They infer that in 1866 and 1870 the losing side was beaten not so much because the strategy of the victors was perfect, as because the defeated armies were ill-led, unprepared, and deficient in the tremendous energy and driving power which the Germans knew how to impart to their operations; and that this energy and driving power directed against indifferent generals, compelled success to crown doubtful strategy and dangerous battle tactics.

German present-day tactics spring from the sound conviction that while modern weapons ensure the practical inviolability of fronts against purely frontal attacks, the flanks of armies are weaker than ever. Long ranging weapons, whether guns or rifles, provide an assailant with the means of bringing to bear converging fire to an extent unknown in the days of 'Brown Bess' and but incompletely appreciated even in 1866 and 1870. From this it follows that if the flanks of an army are lapped round by converging fire its resistance will crumble from flanks to centre, and ruin will overtake the whole structure of the defence. Thus the conclusion is reached that the hostile flanks having become the true objective of attack the forward movement of an army should be so effected as to enable it most readily to attack and lap round the enemy's wings.

Hence the German method of applying superior force aims

at envelopment, to be brought about by effecting the concentration on the battlefield of an army which has marched in separate bodies on a front, more or less wide, dictated by the road system of the theatre of operations—the roads being used to their utmost capacity for the movement of the converging columns—and by the strategical information available at the outset. It is a method of war which limits the direct influence of the commander-in-chief to the initial direction given to the columns into which he has divided his army: once movement has begun, the commander-in-chief is in the hands of his column commanders. A mistake in direction given to an army so operating can be rectified only with great difficulty, if at all. The commander-in-chief has nothing in hand with which to create a new situation should the action of his various columns fail to produce the situation he desires from their collision with the hostile army.

The direct influence of the commander-in-chief being absent, success must be sought in a spirit of co-operation and enterprise, which has become so much a second nature that the leaders of the separate columns will not hesitate to attack the enemy wherever found, in the certain knowledge that by so doing they are taking pressure off some other portion of the army. This postulates bold and intelligent handling of the separate columns by resourceful and able commanders. Good results will only be attained from this method of war by an army whose peace training has aimed at the cultivation of a spirit of self-reliance, energy, and bold initiative, and has by this produced a very high average of leadership throughout the whole army. Genius is not required in a German commander-in-chief; on the other hand, the average among German generals and their subordinate commanders is pitched very high. The aim of the Great General Staff in Berlin is not to produce one Napoleon, but to make of every corps and divisional commander a worthy peer of Constantin von Alvensleben and of Hiller von Gärtringen, men who will use the perfect instrument placed in their hands with the energy and intelligent initiative shown by the leader of the 3rd Corps at Mars-la-Tour, and of the 1st Division of the Guard at Königgrätz.

It is hoped that the enemy, bewildered by attacks everywhere, pressed at all points with such resolution that he does not know which way to turn, his flanks crushed in as by the arms of some mighty octopus, will either be destroyed where he stands, or will use his reserves to cover his retreat, if indeed he decides in time to retreat, and so escape a Sedan by accepting

a Liao Yang. Hence the worship of the offensive which characterises the German Army of to-day: the enemy is to be stunned by blow on blow before he is strangled. Strong reserves are not kept in hand because it is held that guns and rifles are of more use if employed from the beginning of an engagement to intensify and maintain the most vigorous pressure it is possible to apply from the outset.

The danger to which an army is exposed which operates on the German method is defeat in detail by a concentrated adversary who may overwhelm a part of the army while holding off the remainder by a skilful use of detachments—that the octopus may lose some of its limbs, and perhaps be stabbed to the heart, before its powerful tentacles have gripped its victim. Consequently the answer to the German method of war is one which will permit the army opposing a German Army to retain that freedom of movement of which it is the aim of a German commander to deprive his adversary.

In what is now known as the new French system of war, French generals believe that they possess such a method. In formulating their doctrine they do not claim to have discovered anything new, but only to have brought to light the long forgotten method by which Napoleon won his battles, a method never formulated in words by its great exponent, but none the less to be traced, by those who have eyes to see, as a single golden thread woven through the rough texture of his many battles. It is the application of the principle called by French writers, '*l'économie des forces*'—the husbanding of forces, not in any doubting or miserly spirit of 'saving against a rainy day' which was so despairing a feature of our South African battles, but solely to admit of the freest and most lavish expenditure of the carefully stored reservoir of force when the situation is ripe for the production of what Napoleon called '*l'événement*.' Thus a decision is sought by the intervention of fresh troops, at a time and place to be determined by the commander-in-chief, in the light of information which he will have obtained of the dispositions and movements of the enemy. Battle, in accordance with the French conception of war, comprises two distinct operations: the action of a detachment of all arms, called the General Advanced Guard, including an unusually large proportion of cavalry, whose rôle is to discover the enemy's dispositions, to fix him by fighting without itself being destroyed, and, by so holding him, to give the commander-in-chief a target for the decisive attack by the mass of the army, held back under his immediate control

until, in his opinion, formed on a sure basis of ascertained facts, the moment has come to overwhelm that portion of the hostile army whose destruction will most vitally affect the situation.

The portion selected for destruction may be the centre but in most cases will be the column or columns forming one of the hostile wings. Against that wing a force so overwhelming will be launched that it will be outnumbered, outfought and crushed before assistance can reach it from elsewhere. It will thus be seen that, besides an efficient and mobile fighting machine in which the initiative of subordinate leaders must be tempered by restraint to ensure complete control by the higher command, the French conception of war postulates a high degree of skill and character in the two men on whose judgement and nerve the fate of the army rests—the commander of the general advance guard and the commander-in-chief. The former must not only know how to fight, but must be a master of the infinitely more difficult art of when and how to break off a fight. He must be able to fight long enough and hard enough to rend the veil which shrouds the situation, and to draw upon himself a great hostile force; and yet by timely retreat, combined with timely resistance, he must keep his detachment from being overwhelmed before his commander-in-chief can prepare and deliver the great stroke which is the ‘crowning mercy’ of French war. Upon the commander-in-chief rests the tremendous responsibility of deciding when the situation is ripe for decisive action, and on his nerve and on his skill it rests to make the blow effective in time and direction. If he strikes too soon he risks making a blow in the air; if he hesitates too long he is lost and his army with him, for he will find himself, like Kuropatkin at Liao Yang, using his reserves, not to win a battle, but to cover a retreat, or he may be driven to expend them in desperate efforts to cut a path through the arms of the octopus which his delay has allowed to grip his army closer and closer.

On both sides of the Vosges it is fully realised that victory must be sought in a resolute offensive, that passive defence will as heretofore always lead to complete defeat. Where the two conceptions of war diverge in principle is in this. The German contention is that, given adequate numbers and a general direction towards the enemy, which can be ascertained by a consideration of his probable courses of action, success will crown the offensive if only that offensive is made with sufficient vigour: that a vigorous initiative will always force

the enemy to conform and to surrender his own scheme of operations. While admitting that only in an offensive with adequate numbers and firm determination can success be found, the French believe that that offensive must be directed at the enemy's most vulnerable spot, that, therefore, it must be based on knowledge of where and in what strength the enemy is so as to ensure that the blow shall be timely and effective. Consequently that the offensive may be postponed, often will be postponed, while information is being sought for and fought for. A German general is content to direct the march of his army on hypothesis based on a consideration of the most probable course of action of his adversary—as was Moltke on the morning of July 2, 1866, and on August 15, 1870. This hypothesis will be verified in a general manner by the divisions of independent cavalry in advance of the army, which, however, the French contend form an organ of strategical exploration too weak in fighting power to pierce a strongly constituted covering screen: they can only report the presence of covering troops in certain localities, from which scanty information the commander must deduce what he may.

A French commander, on the other hand, insists on knowing what he is doing and will only resort to hypothesis in the last extremity, so provides himself with a strong detachment of great fighting power to tear aside the veil of the unknown and to hold his enemy in a given direction while he manœuvres to attack him.

German war is a step from an uncertain present to an unknown future—the fate which lurks hidden in the womb of a still unfought battle—in French war the step into the unknown is taken from the sure basis of the known. The German conception of war embodies a splendid confidence in courage and initiative and the simplest possible application of force by average men: in the French conception of war we see a craving for certainty characteristic of a logical race, and a faith in trained skill well befitting a nation which has long believed that its genius has led Europe in every field of science and art. It would seem that the character of a nation is woven close into the texture of a national conception of war. Starting from this axiom, and with the French and German conceptions of war before us, we can proceed to examine the teaching of our newly formed General Staff which will show us how the British Army stands in this respect.

II.

In all modern armies the teaching of the General Staff is embodied in a condensed form in the training manuals of the three arms, as well as in various regulations and instructions for service in the field, such as our 'Field Service Regulations.' This teaching is imparted to the troops during the training season and forms the basis of criticism which follows on the manoeuvres in which the year's training culminates, such as our own 'Memorandum on Army Training, 1910.' From time to time the Historical Section of a General Staff publishes histories and studies of past campaigns which are universally held to be of the utmost value in bringing home to an army the problems of real war and thus educating officers for the Staff and for higher command. For many years now the soldiers of the Continent have realised that the critical study of past wars is an essential element in that methodical preparation for future war which is the sole *raison d'être* of an army in peace time.

The work of the Historical Section of the General Staffs of France and Germany has attained a high level of research, exposition and criticism. The most instructive studies we possess of any British campaign are those on the South African War emanating from the Great General Staff in Berlin. It is not too much to say that the French official account of the war of 1870 is the most complete, most accurate, and most instructive history ever written of any war in any country. It is a model of balanced, yet bold and incisive criticism. If the myths which, for good reasons of its own, the German General Staff have allowed to veil some incidents of the war are now brushed aside in this publication, the authors of the French Official History have not spared the pride and vanity of their own countrymen. Never before has any army criticised itself so unsparingly, never before has any army stepped so naked to the stool of repentance—the army beaten at Jena repented in sackcloth and ashes, but it did not take all Europe into its confidence with the courage of the French General Staff. The justification for this course is the instruction of the French Army—the General Staff wishes it to learn how and why it was beaten, and to teach it how it intends it to win when the call to arms sounds once more. Hence the criticism is not merely destructive: situation after situation is analysed and for those who have eyes to see it is written clearly, how, in the opinion of the French General Staff, a solution should have been sought for. It is permeated by the modern French

conception of war. The reader finds himself instinctively approaching the problems of 1870 from the point of view of a French General of to-day—and that is what the French General Staff desires, for its Official History is no mere chronicle of events, but a great instrument of teaching.

It is by the high standard thus set we must judge the work of the Historical Section of the Imperial Defence Committee which has recently been created to play in England the part taken by the Historical Section of the General Staff of a Continental army. The wars of an island power involve such close co-operation between Army and Navy that the Government was probably well advised to commit the writing of history to a body which by its very constitution can take a wider view of the essentially Imperial problem of what is now known as 'amphibious war' than could a General Staff whose functions and interests were purely military. At the same time we must recognise that there are certain drawbacks which result from placing the officers writing military history under a different roof from the General Staff.

In the first volume of the Official History of the Russo-Japanese War prepared by the Historical Section of the Committee of Imperial Defence we have an account of the campaign from the opening of hostilities to the close of the first great attack on Port Arthur on August 24, 1904. The first twenty-four chapters tell the story of the genesis of the war, its development and progress both by sea and land. It is not till we reach the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth chapters that we arrive at the considered opinions of the Admiralty and of the General Staff of the Army which are embodied in two chapters of naval and military comments. The chapters of narrative are unilluminated by criticism, and though it is possible to gauge the opinions of the writers as to the operations they describe, the impression remains that the value of the work would have been enhanced had the example of the French Historical Section in its account of the campaign of 1870 been followed and criticism been made to keep pace with narrative instead of being relegated to a separate chapter of comments. But this blemish, if indeed it is a blemish, is a minor matter; what concerns us here more immediately is to estimate how the Historical Section has discharged its task of writing history as a means of teaching war.

We may as well say at once that in so far as they have produced a comprehensive, lucid, and balanced history of the operations during the period covered by this volume, fully illustrated by clear and carefully drawn maps, the soldiers

and sailors of the Historical Section have performed their task admirably. If we compare this volume of the British Official History with the corresponding chapters of the German Official Account of the Russo-Japanese War and with the study of the war which is being published in the 'Revue Militaire des Armées Étrangères' by the French General Staff we must congratulate our Historical Section on a notable achievement. It has not feared to match itself with the military writers of France and Germany in attempting a task to the fulfilment of which they bring greater experience and greater prestige than our newly formed Historical Section can lay claim to, and the result is that the British Official History is, *as a record*, the best account of the Manchurian War yet produced by a European General Staff. The relative importance and interdependence of the Naval and Military operations are clearly developed, while a just sense of proportion has enabled the writers to describe events in considerable detail without allowing the mass of detail to obscure the broad outlines of the operations, as is the case in some of the later chapters of the German Official Account. Whether or no the British Official History contains all the facts necessary to form a judgment on the war will only be known finally when the General Staffs of Japan and Russia have completed the histories of the war upon which they are now engaged. The fact that the proof sheets of the volume before us 'have been very carefully revised at Tokio, both in the Admiralty and the 'War Office' and that 'much useful information has also been supplied by the Historical Section of the War Office 'in St. Petersburg' indicates that neither from Japan nor Russia need we expect any startling revelations to controvert the version of our own Historical Section, which will probably stand on its own merits as an adequate, conscientious, and thorough record of the events of a momentous war.

Before we examine the criticisms of our General Staff on the operations in Manchuria, and so attempt to appraise the instructional value of our Official History of the War, we must turn to our Field Service Regulations to see what methods of war our General Staff advocates. If the comments in the Official History are to have any value for the Army they must be in consonance with the doctrine of war which the General Staff is teaching. Part I. of Field Service Regulations 1909 is headed 'Operations.' It is prefaced by the following words: 'This Manual is issued by command of the Army Council. It deals with the general principles which govern the leading in war of the Army. The training manuals of the various arms

'are based on these regulations, which, in case of any doubt arising, are the ruling authority.'

In the chapter entitled 'The Battle' we find a condensed but adequate summary of the enveloping attack, its advantages and drawbacks which we have already described at some length as the German method.* It is followed by the following paragraph :

'A commander may also decide to obtain the decision of the battle by manœuvre on the battle-field with a large general reserve which he has retained in his own hand. By keeping a considerable part of his force under control, he is in a position to take advantage of an enemy's mistakes and to choose his own moment for striking, but, if this method is to be successful, the size of his army must allow him to keep in close touch with the course of events on the battle-field, and to strike with his reserve at the right place and time. *This method will usually be most suited to the circumstances of our Army, and has been chiefly considered in the succeeding sections.*'

The sections on 'The Attack' which follow the above still further develop this idea, and make clear the fact that our General Staff intends a British battle, like a French battle, to culminate in decisive attack on that portion of the hostile army the destruction of which will produce the most decisive result.

As we have endeavoured to show above in considering French ideas, the decisive attack is an integral part of the French method of fighting because it is the logical consequence of a conception of war in which knowing all about the enemy and hampering his operations precedes taking decisive action against him—a conception which is the logical consequence of accentuating the importance of the factors of information and time gained by exploiting the resisting and penetrating powers of strong detachments of all arms. It is the direct opposite of the German method, which in itself is a perfectly logical whole springing from a conception of war in which the ruling factors are held to be seizing and maintaining the initiative at all costs and the envelopment of an enemy whose general direction is often only surmised to avoid loss of time, and consequent loss of initiative, in more accurate verification.

The Japanese Army was trained on German lines. The German Official Account tells us that :

'About the middle of the eighties the then Major Meckel began a successful course of instruction in the Japanese Army. His labour were continued to the middle of the nineties by Captain von Blank

* F.S.R., I. sect. 102, para. (3).

enburg and Majors von Wildenbruck and Freiherr von Grutschreiber. From this time dates the close similarity with German military institutions that can be traced in the organisation and administration of the army, in the regulations and in the views of the officer-corps . . .

In short Meckel and his comrades infused the Japanese Army with the German conception of war. Hence we are not surprised to find that the Japanese, having by an exhaustive study of the conditions affecting the concentration of the Russian Army determined that Liao Yang was the point at which the first great battle would be fought.

' . . . resolved that from the first their troops must be deployed upon the mainland of Manchuria in such a way as to enable them to envelope their enemy at Liao Yang. The whole campaign forms an interesting example of a strategic deployment made with the avowed object of culminating in a decisive battle at a definite point.' *

Our Historical Section thus recognises that it is about to criticise the operations of an army whose conception of war leads to methods of action quite other than its own. It is a pity that it has not told us what it thinks of the Russian Army, and what conception of war, if any, was to be pitted against men trained by Meckel to think like Moltke. In the German Official Account we find no such reticence. The chapter on the opposing forces is a pæan in honour of the 'Exerzier-Reglement,' German training and German methods. After emphasising the points where the Russian regulations differed from the German, and indicating the deduction which it desires its own army to make, it says :

' Along with the unwarlike training of both individual soldier and units, who had been brought up under a complete misapprehension of modern fire action, the inability of the lower and higher grades to act on their own initiative showed to particular disadvantage. But the training of the Staff officers, of superior commanders, too, was not up to modern requirements. General and Staff officers, however, who have not become intimately conversant already in peace with the conditions governing the movements of modern masses, must be at a loss when confronted by them in war. Improvising anything at such a moment is then as good as impossible.' †

Among the things the Russian Army failed to improvise was a conception of war. This is a fact of the utmost importance to bear in mind in studying the Russo-Japanese War ;

* British Official History of the Russo-Japanese War, vol. i. p. 405.

† German Official Account 'Yalu,' p. 64.

it is not clearly brought out in our Official History. Incidents are described from which this fact can be deduced, but so essential an element in the Japanese successes should not have been left to the reader to discover.

Our General Staff has been adversely criticised for its tendency to adhere to French methods of war rather than to German. In an interesting and instructive series of articles the able Military Correspondent of the 'Times' has developed the strong points of German war, while pointing out the weakness of certain elements in the prevailing French doctrines. One of his strongest arguments in favour of German methods is that they succeeded in 1866, in 1870, and again in 1904-5 in Manchuria.

We cannot but feel that our General Staff has to no small extent brought this criticism upon itself by failing to make its own position in the matter clear when writing the lucid and informing appreciation of Japanese strategy which forms the most instructive pages of the chapter of Military Comments in the first volume of the Official History. This volume is the first fruits of our newly formed Historical Section; for the first time in the history of our Army we have before us the considered opinion of the best brains in the Army on the problems of a war which held the attention of every soldier in Europe. This volume was published in 1910, one year after the General Staff had produced the Field Service Regulations in which, also for the first time in the history of our Army, its leaders and teachers have laid down definitely what method of battle forms the kernel of its training. The victors in the war whose story our Historical Section has now set out to tell were infused with a conception of war which is the direct opposite to that which lies behind the method that our General Staff has pronounced in its opinion to be 'most suited to the circumstances of our Army.'* In spite of this fact those who are responsible for this book have omitted to point out that the German war waged by Japanese armies succeeded in great measure because the army of the beaten side was innocent of any conception of war, was, in fact, courage apart, a thoroughly bad army. It has missed the opportunity of showing how the last victim of German war—the army beaten in every battle from the Yalu to Mukden—had this trait in common with all the former victims of German war, that it was quite unfit for the grim encounter, and not least so because it was uninspired by any glimmering of an all-pervading, coherent, reasoned con-

* Field Service Regulations, Pt. I. p. 112.

ception of war which it is the first duty of a General Staff to lose no opportunity of teaching to the army whose guide and servant it is. Hitherto German war has been fortunate in its antagonists, the Austrian Army of Bohemia, with its muzzle-loading rifle and its fatal predilection for being beaten in detail for no conceivable object; the French Army of 1870, unready, ill-led, out-numbered; the Russian Army of Manchuria with its 'unwarlike training of both individual soldier and units.' And the generals who have led to the slaughter-house the victims of German war!—Benedek, Bazaine, MacMahon, Kuropatkin—surely Moltke, and the men he inspired were fortunate in their opponents!

The main criticism we have to make on the work of our General Staff as presented to us in this volume is to note a certain diffidence in the exposition of the system of war which it has set out to teach the Army in its Field Service Regulations. The following extract will make our meaning clear:

'At a time like the present, when tactical opinion on the Continent of Europe is divided into two distinct schools, nothing could have been more instructive from the point of view of the student than to see an enveloping attack on the new system (i.e. practically without reserves to meet emergencies) met by a well-organised counter-stroke and the result fought out under equal conditions of training and leadership. Instances are not wanting in the history of past wars of decisive victory being gained by a vigorous, timely, and well-directed counter-offensive; and it may safely be said that there is nothing in the Russo-Japanese War to prove that similar methods will be less effective in the future.'*

This negative, unconvinced and unconvincing dictum is followed by a reference to General Stakelberg's attempt to win the battle of Te-li-ssu by an ill-prepared and unco-ordinated attack with his reserves, which leads our General Staff to the following deduction: 'Had General Stakelberg's orders been 'clearer, and had the co-operation between Generals Gerngross and Glasko been closer, the effect produced would have been 'different; at the same time there is no convincing evidence 'to show that the result of the battle would have been altered.'† This is not the way to convince the Army of the soundness of the doctrine inculcated in sections 107 to 110 of Field Service Regulations, that a defender's road to victory lies in decisive counter-attack by the general reserve, combined with an assumption of the offensive by the whole army—a doctrine

* British Official History, vol. i. p. 427.

† Ibid.

of the defensive which is the logical counterpart of that doctrine of the offensive which seeks for success in decisive attack by the assailant's general reserve.

It is not thus that the Great General Staff in Berlin conceives its duty to the army to which it has given the cult of the initiative as the key to victory. Writing of this same battle of Te-li-ssu it says

' . . . in spite of the many mistakes committed by the Russians, in spite of their inferior conduct of the action when compared with that of the Japanese, it was for some time altogether uncertain whether the Japanese would prove victorious ; it is another proof of the initiative being always sure to conquer a difficult situation.'*

In season and out of season the Great General Staff is to be found on page after page of its Official Account impressing on the German Army the soundness of its own conception of war : the events of the Russo-Japanese War are of interest to it only in so far as they will help German officers in Germany's next war to play their part the better for having pondered the lessons of Manchurian battlefields.

The same spirit animates the French General Staff. The defeat of detachments at the Yalu and at Te-li-ssu, if the reasons for defeat are not made clear, may lead the French Army to lose faith in a method of war which places a detachment in contact with the enemy—to call a detachment a 'General Advanced Guard' makes it no less a detachment—so we find the following comment on Te-li-ssu :

' Le combat de Wafangou—Télisse se présente, pour nous, avec un aspect qui rappelle singulièrement la bataille sur le Yalu. Ici, également, nous trouvons un élément lourd, un corps d'armée, poussé à dix jours de marche du gros de l'armée, au contact d'un ennemi supérieur. Refusera-t-il le combat ? Un élément plus faible en eût fait tout autant. L'acceptera-t-il ? Ce sera sur un front exagéré, échappant à l'action du commandement ; inévitablement, certaines fractions seront accrochées ; les autres devront les secourir ; donc, sur l'ensemble, pèsera la menace complexe de la percée sur un ou plusieurs points du front, ajoutée à celle de l'enveloppement sur les ailes.' †

The French Army, knowing that its General Advanced Guards are not 'éléments lourds,' but extremely mobile, and that they are not pushed out to distances of ten days' march from

* German Official Account 'Wa-fan-gou,' p. 250.

† La Guerre Russo-Japonaise, p. 475 of *Revue Militaire des Armées Étrangères* for 1908.

the main body, will be reassured as to French doctrines on reading the above comments ; and the battles of the Yalu and of Te-li-ssu will fall into their proper focus.

We trust that in the coming volumes of the Official History of the Russo-Japanese War which are to complete the work, our General Staff will take the opportunity afforded by the narrative of events in Manchuria to impress upon our Army the value of the conception of war which should underlie the Regulations governing its training. As the hostile critic in the 'Times' has pointed out, it is extremely desirable that the Army should know how the General Staff intends to deal with the enveloping attack characteristic of the German method of war. There can be no better opportunity for doing this than in the pages of our Official History of a war remarkable for the success which attended German methods as applied by the Japanese. The enterprise of Herr von Donat and his publisher, has placed in the hands of English readers a faithful—though somewhat too literal—translation of the German Official Account of the Russo-Japanese War, in which, as we have shown, the Great General Staff has missed no opportunity of enlarging on the inherent soundness of its own teaching. If our General Staff does not agree with that teaching, it is incumbent on it to ensure that the History of the Manchurian Campaign which it intends its own officers to read is permeated and vivified by its own doctrine of war, otherwise it runs the risk of finding them imbibing the teaching of the Great General Staff in Berlin as presented in the German Official Account.

The Military Correspondent of the 'Times,' in criticising English theories as embodied in our Field Service Regulations, takes some comfort to himself in the reflection that the Memorandum on Army Training 1910 adumbrates a possible conversion to those German methods of war which he champions with so much ability and knowledge. We venture to doubt if his inference is correct. After a brief but sufficient summary of the method of battle advocated for the British Army in section 102 (4) of Field Service Regulations, and that described in section 102 (3) which is the method of envelopement, the Memorandum says :

'During the past training season we have seen commanders endeavour to put in practice each of the above theories, and not the least important lesson learnt is the danger which we should run if we were to endeavour to introduce a cult of any particular form of action. Each method is no doubt suitable to different circumstances, and success depends not so much on the inherent soundness of a principle or plan of operations as on the method

of application of the principle and the resolution with which the plan is carried out. . . .

‘. . . . In “Field Service Regulations,” Part I. section 102, para. 3, it is stated that the envelopment theory is consistent with a decided superiority in power. For its successful application accurate information, the initiative, and a continuous offensive are also necessary. To apply it against a commander of equal ability or against a force of equal or superior numbers and equal tactical training, or to couple it with an attitude of expectancy dictated by a lack of reliable information, is to depart from sound principles.’

Which amounts to saying ‘We have no objection to the German theory of war, provided it is applied against a carefully selected adversary, who is sufficiently our inferior either in numbers, capacity, or morale, and about whom we have all the information necessary to justify us in taking liberties.’ On such an adversary there is obviously no need to draw the delicate and tempered blade of Napoleonic war: any cudgel will suffice to give the *coup de grâce*.

We are safe in assuming that in deciding on the methods of operation advocated in Field Service Regulations, our General Staff has paid our possible enemies the compliment of assuming that they will not be our inferiors either in numbers, training or resolute leadership.

There is, however, in the Memorandum a dictum which we are unable to accept without considerable reservation. It is this: ‘. . . success depends not so much on the inherent soundness of a principle or plan of operations as on the method of application of the principle and the resolution with which the plan is carried out.’ As it stands this dictum is so like a platitude as to be convincing in its simplicity, and yet it is liable, if not rightly interpreted, to lead an army very far down the smooth path of loose thinking which leads to disaster. The trap lies in the last sentence ‘the resolution with which the plan is carried out.’ ‘Resolution’ is not a Heaven-sent gift; it is a quality of mind, the product of keen desire to perform a certain act and the sure knowledge of how to accomplish it. The application of resolution to an operation of war postulates a high degree of confidence; in the higher command ‘self-confidence’; in the subordinate commanders and troops ‘confidence in the higher command.’ Now in war self-confidence in a commander, and confidence in him on the part of his subordinates, are the especial prerogative of armies in which commanders and subordinate leaders alike are bound together by a definite conception of war common to the whole army,

as in the German Army of 1870 and the Japanese Army of 1904, or, to go back a few generations, in the armies led by Napoleon and by our own Duke of Wellington. 'Resolution' in war is the child of what General Langlois calls 'la doctrine': emphatically it is not the child of what he calls 'les textes' in the sentence we have already quoted from his 'Leçons de deux guerres récentes.' But in an army which is so universally imbued with a definite doctrine of war as to be capable at all times and in all places of resolute action we do not find leaders operating alternately by methods which derive from conceptions of war as far asunder as the poles.

The examination we have made of the attitude of our General Staff as shown in Field Service Regulations, in the Memorandum on Army Training 1910, and in the Official History of the Russo-Japanese War reveals the following state of affairs. In Field Service Regulations is advocated a method of action similar to that which in France is the logical outcome of a definite conception of war and is opposed to that practised in Germany which is the equally logical outcome of a different conception of war. In our Official History of the Russo-Japanese War we have seen that our General Staff, unlike those of France and Germany, has not taken the opportunity presented to it to impress seriously upon the Army the soundness of that doctrine of war which is the logical and necessary spiritual link between the methods it advocates in Field Service Regulations and the parent conception of war which is the sole justification for adopting any particular method of action. In the Memorandum on Army Training we find the General Staff, while still advocating the *Method* inculcated in Field Service Regulations, has definitely pronounced against 'the *cult* of any particular form of action.'

As long ago as October 1806 the Prussian Army learnt that the cult of any 'form' is the shortest possible road to disaster. But behind the 'forms of action' of French and German war are great conceptions, each in itself perfectly logical and yet diverging from the outset because each is based on a totally different evaluation of some of the many factors which compose the act of force we know as war. These conceptions, which lie behind the 'forms of action,' have been held worthy of homage by soldiers so educated and so earnest as those who guide the military destinies of France and Germany. It would be rash in any critic to assume that their bearing on British war has not been examined and appraised by the thinkers of our own General Staff. It is true that, owing to its diffidence in criticism, and the hesitancy in exposition of the standpoint from which it

views the operations of the Russian and Japanese armies in Manchuria, our Historical Section lends colour to such a rash assumption, yet we are convinced that the seemingly negative attitude of our General Staff on this momentous subject has been deliberately adopted and is in keeping with the character and organisation of the British Army as it is to-day. Although the more purely official publications we have referred to are silent on this point we find it elucidated in an important pronouncement recently made by the Director of Military Operations at the War Office, Brigadier-General H. H. Wilson.

On the 5th of December 1910 General Wilson delivered a lecture before the Aldershot Military Society on the subject of 'Initiative and the Power of Manœuvre' in which the Prevailing French and German doctrines are clearly explained and examined. After showing in what these doctrines consist, and where they diverge, General Wilson says :

' Which then should we adopt ?

' My own opinion is this :

' If by forethought, by previous arrangement, by careful and systematic training in everything that goes for mobility, if arrangements can be completed which will allow our force to be based on an arc, then I am a firm believer in the French system of war.

' If on the other hand, when war breaks out, we find ourselves with no superior mobility, unaccustomed to long and tiresome marches, unaccustomed to carry more than the "unexpended portion" of the day's rations, ignorant of how to requisition, ignorant of how to billet, still served by horse traction, instead of motor traction, in our supply services, and operating in a strange country, and not only surrounded by the "fog of war," but by the fog of war in an unknown tongue, then I am all in favour of the simple and more primitive German methods and in vulgar parlance of having a slogging match.

' But let us clearly understand the difference. (a) In the first case, we give ourselves every chance not only of defeating even numbers, but of annihilating the enemy's forces.

' (b) Whereas, in the second case, we can only at best hope for some sort of indecisive victory, the action to be renewed on terms disadvantageous to us.* (Because we do not greatly outnumber our opponents.)'

And again he tells us :

' In a word, if we have made our small little army so mobile that we are practically a flying column, based on several alternative places, then let us follow the Napoleonic principle of restricted initiative, a momentary pause, and then a smashing blow.

* Initiative and the Power of Manœuvre, p. 7.

' But on the other hand . . . if we have not made our army so mobile as to be practically a flying column, then let us give up all idea of copying Napoleon, and let us, as I said before, trust to win by a slogging match.

' That we have men with the ability to carry out the French plan I firmly believe.

' Whether the Expeditionary Force is a weapon so finely tempered, so organised and administered as to enable its commander to employ it in this most delicate of all operations, I am afraid I must leave to wiser heads than mine to determine.*

When we remember that General Wilson was till recently the Commandant of the Staff College, and as such charged with the higher military education of future officers of the General Staff; that he now fills the responsible position of Director of Military Operations at the War Office, a General Staff appointment of the first rank, we shall not err if we attach the greatest importance to this pronouncement and if we assume that it is intended to fill some of the *lacunæ* which we have noticed in the more purely official publications we have examined. Such a man as General Wilson does not speak lightly: on such a matter his opinion is not individual, but corporate; his voice is the voice of the General Staff, the thinking and teaching organ of our army. What he tells us is worthy of the closest attention on the part of those who have at heart the well-being of our army, and who desire to understand how it is to play its part in modern war.

What General Wilson tells us amounts to this. Of the two systems of war we have before us, French war and German war, the French conception is the sounder, but he leaves us with the impression that, as at present organised and administered, our army is not yet a perfect instrument for that particular system of war. He does not for a moment contemplate the possibility of fighting one day on one system and the next day on the other. To a serious student of war like General Wilson such an idea would be inconceivable. He does, however, contemplate the possibility of our being obliged to fight on the German system because our army is not mobile enough or handy enough to fight on the French system. General Wilson's revelation of the official mind enables us to interpret that passage of the Memorandum on Army Training which we have noted above and to which in its crude presentation we took exception, i.e. the possibility of operating alternately on the French and German methods.

* Initiative and the Power of Manœuvre, p. 9.

The conclusion we arrive at from our consideration of the publications we have examined is that while the General Staff has selected for the Army a 'method of action' it has failed to give it a 'doctrine of war,' not because it has formed no particular 'conception of war,' but because it does not consider the organisation and administration of the army as yet quite adequate to the tasks which would be imposed on it by the form of war it considers the best. The General Staff has still to bear in mind the possibility that our army, owing to a lack of mobility and 'handiness,' due to its present organisation and administration, may have to operate on other methods. It is consequently right to postpone indoctrinating it with the 'conception of war' which logically underlies the 'methods of action' it advocates, until the organisation and administration of the army have made it a perfect instrument in its hand for the purpose required.

From the report of Mr. Haldane's speech on Army Estimates 1911-12, as given in the 'Times' of March 15, we learn that great attention is being given to improving the army in this vital respect and that he anticipates that the reforms which are now to be undertaken will increase the mobility of the Expeditionary Force and will make it more flexible.

Echoing the words of General Langlois already quoted: 'Sans doctrine, les textes ne sont rien: à des textes sans doctrine, serait de beaucoup préférable une doctrine sans textes,' we can only record our regret that conditions do not yet permit the teaching of a doctrine of war, and express the hope that the reforms in organisation and administration announced by Mr. Haldane may soon justify the General Staff in infusing our army with a definite and coherent conception of war in which empiricism will find no place.

ART. IV.—THE PURSUIT OF REASON.

1. *The Pursuit of Reason.* By C. F. KEARY, M.A. Cambridge : at the University Press. 1910.
2. *On a General Tendency of Thought during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century.* By Dr. J. THEODORE MERZ. Andrew Reid and Co. 1910.
3. *Philosophical Essays.* By BERTRAM RUSSELL, M.A., F.R.S. Longmans, Green and Co.

IN the pursuit of knowledge the goal whither man would be is the whole of knowledge and knowledge of the whole. So much will be freely admitted by those who most fully recognise that the goal is an ideal never to be attained by man. What then is the starting-point in the pursuit of knowledge? At the beginning of his chapter on Reality, Mr. Keary states it thus :

‘A man is out in the fields of a morning in spring. About him is a manifold of sights and sounds. A budding hedge here upon his left, and a little way down it an elm tree draped by a thin veil of green ; a copse of beeches, dark still in the mass, upon his right hand ; a grass meadow, beginning to put on its spring brightness, dotted with daisies and dandelions, rises before him to meet the opal sky ; sheep are bleating upon one side, calling their lambs ; and from the ploughed field upon the other a lark has just risen, and ascends by jerks, now just above the hedge, then ten yards higher, till in a no-time he has got into the sky ; the cawing of rooks, the crowing of cocks are in the air, and the rumbling of a wain upon an invisible road ; now and again the gentle sound of the wind moves over the grass.’

This, Mr. Keary says, is the statement not of a theory but of a fact, ‘an elementary fact, anterior to all theories that would ‘explain it’ ; ‘the knowledge here described is the true ‘antecedent of all other knowledge.’ The actual, matter of fact, starting-point of our knowledge is, at whatever moment we take it, a whole—a whole of experience. If we are tempted to suppose that it is not a whole but a ‘manifold,’ made up of the various items which Mr. Keary has enumerated in his description of the scene, Mr. Keary’s reply is that a ‘manifold’ might be made up that way, but the real scene cannot be ; and that for a very simple reason : ‘it is evident upon reflection ‘that the parts of each “manifold” have no real existence as ‘such. No man ever saw a lark *in abstracto* singing in no sky, ‘an elm growing from no ground.’ Mr. Keary does not succeed,

however, in making his position quite clear to us ; and the reason why he does not succeed seems to be that though he draws a distinction between a whole, or a unity, and a manifold, he does not always adhere to it when drawn. Let us therefore first try to understand the distinction, as he draws it. By a manifold he means something which we construct, and which we construct by putting various items together. By a whole he means something which we find, or which is given to us, in our experience, e.g. such a scene as that which he pictures in the first quotation given above from his book. And he quite definitely disallows the use of the word 'manifold' to describe a whole : a whole is something given together ; a manifold implies 'that some earlier experiences have been lumped 'together to form this one.' But having drawn the distinction, Mr. Keary soon proceeds to obliterate it, or to forget it. When he says on one page that 'every branch of art deals with 'manifolds,' and later on (though in the same chapter) that the proper subjects for artistic reasoning are wholes, we may be inclined to the conjecture that he has forgotten it. But when we find him saying within the compass of one short sentence that 'each manifold is really a unity,' we feel that he is obliterating a distinction which is really a matter of capital importance for his theory of knowledge.

Whether, however, we draw or refuse to draw a distinction between a manifold and a unity or whole, clearly it is from some phase of our experience—such as is illustrated by the scene which Mr. Keary draws at the beginning of his chapter on Reality—that we start in our pursuit of knowledge. Clearly, too, Mr. Keary is right in saying that such a phase of experience is not made up 'by adding an elm to the ground, a lark to the 'sky, and so forth till the scene was complete. The scene is 'there.' We may proceed to distinguish the scene into its various features, or we may not ; but to say that the features first existed in our experience, and then were lumped together with the result that the scene eventually came into existence is plainly an error ; and not merely an error but a self-contradiction, for on this explanation of the experience we have to start from the assumption that there is at the beginning no experience to explain. We start then, in the pursuit of knowledge, from some scene or other of experience. We do not start by beginning to paint the scene. The scene is there, with its various features. And whether the features do or do not make a satisfactory whole, a unity, they are interdependent on one another, in such a way that to change them, or their relations to each other, would be to change the scene :

the *ensemble* (as Comte, in an early tract, termed it), or the 'together' as Dr. Merz phrases it, which the scene presents, or which constitutes the scene, whether it be a whole or not, is a fact; and it is the fact from which we actually start in the pursuit of knowledge.

It is, then, from a scene of interdependent features that we start, and must start. It is from such an *ensemble* that science starts. But, inasmuch as false starts are events which do sometimes happen, it will be well to notice carefully what sort of start science makes, and the direction she takes. As Mr. Keary says,

'scientific knowledge proceeds by analysis and abstraction. Out of the scene it takes the tree, out of the tree it abstracts the constituent parts, out of the constituent parts it abstracts the chemical elements. But none of the constituent parts has real existence: not the tree *in abstracto*, nor a leaf *in abstracto*, nor hydrogen *in abstracto*.'

As Mr. Keary says elsewhere, 'with objects in being, with objects as realities, science does not deal.' The direction then in which science moves would appear to be from the first the wrong direction. What is given us to start from is an *ensemble* of interdependent features: the first thing science does is to take one of these features and treat it as though it were not one of a set of interdependent factors but as though it were a thing having an independent existence of its own. Now, it would be a patent injustice to men of science to say, or imagine, that they believe anything which they observe, or on which they experiment, to have an independent existence of its own. Though, for the purposes of observation or experiment, they isolate some one of a set of interdependent factors, they do so knowing full well that they have, for the time being, set aside the other factors, and intending seriously to return to the complex of objects in being from which they started. The question which it is no injustice to put, is whether they do ever, or can ever, return. They follow the path on which they have started: they analyse a thing into molecules, they analyse those molecules into atoms, and those atoms into electrons. But he would be a bold or rather a rash man who should venture to say to science, thus far shalt thou go and no farther. The process of analysis which was not contented to stop at molecules will not rest satisfied with electrons either. But until it does stop, the man of science will not retrace his steps, bringing his sheaves with him. The path of analysis, by which science proceeds, runs on *ad infinitum*, and will run on for ever. Still though it runs on for ever, perhaps that is

no reason why the man of science should not retrace his steps. But it is the reason why, retrace them as he may, he can bring back no final message of truth: if he does not reach the goal for which he started out, he can bring no message back from it. The question, however, whether the man of science, when once he has entered on the path of analysis and abstraction, can ever return to the upper light of day, to objects in being, to the set of interdependent factors from which he started, and which he left behind him—in order to explain them—is a question which we need not pretend to answer. The easier question seems to be not whether he can ever return but whether he does ever return: analysis, indeed, is possible, the chemical analysis of protoplasm; but synthesis, putting together what has been set asunder, does not seem to proceed *pari passu* with analysis. Neither with mineral nor with organic substances does it seem possible to reverse the process of analysis, or by synthesis to return exactly to the real object with which the analysis began. The process of analysis has no finality and cannot be reversed; but, as Dr. Merz says, ‘these two truths have only within the last fifty years become gradually established and largely, though perhaps not generally, admitted.’

In fine, the work of analysis which science undertakes is never-ending, yet until it is ended the process of synthesis cannot begin; and if attempt is made to begin it, it is, and must always be, premature and therefore unsuccessful. The object of science in using the method of analysis and abstraction is to explain experience, or the factors in experience, as given to us; yet science starts by isolating them, that is to say, by ignoring as far as possible what is essential alike to their existence and to the comprehension of them—their interdependence on one another. It would seem then that the start science makes is a false start: from the beginning it makes no attempt to comprehend things, that is, to take them together. It begins by isolating them. If it be replied that it isolates them first in order eventually to comprehend them in their interdependence, then, in view of the fact that analysis by its very nature is never-ending, we cannot help feeling that science not merely adjourns the comprehension of things in their interdependence but adjourns it *sine die*. And in that case, the cause of science goes by default, and man will certainly continue, and be justified in continuing, to do what he has always done: to understand things in their interdependence he will turn, as he always has turned, to art and to religion. They do at any rate try to see things whole—not as forming a whole but as being a whole. To say that they form a whole would be to commit the error

of science, and to postulate things existing independently of one another in order to invent some explanation of their interdependence—to postulate an impossibility to explain the facts.

The assumption of science in the past has been that the interdependence of things on one another can be explained if only we suppose that in their nature and in their origin they are independent. But the problem which science thus proposes to itself is one which science has not yet solved and which is probably insoluble. The problem which art and religion propose for solution, whether soluble or not, is at any rate differently stated; and the assumption which they make is also a different assumption from that made by science. Science assumes that naturally and originally things are independent of one another; and science therefore has to explain, or explain away, their interdependence. Religion and art, on the other hand, accept, as their starting-point, the interdependence of things on one another; and seek to account for that interdependence by the assumption that the things thus interdependent are in some way or other—intelligible only to the religious mind or the artist's mind—really a whole and a unity. The artist—poet or painter—is a man who sees how things which, as given, are merely interdependent may be imagined and represented as wholes: a work, to be a work of art, must be a whole. But, whereas the artist finds in the world materials for many works of art, and thus from the interdependence of things, as given, creates many wholes, the religious mind is essentially concerned with the attempt to see all things as one whole. To say this, however, is to admit that religion, like science, travels away from things as they are, or, at any rate, from things as they are given in experience, in order to find an explanation for them. If it be replied that religion, in seeking to see all things as one whole, is at any rate following the line indicated by the undeniable interdependence of things on one another, the rejoinder may be made that of late years science also has been travelling in that direction. Action and re-action, organism and environment are phrases which suffice to show that science not only acts on the assumption of the mutual interdependence of things but is aware that she so acts. What is the theory of evolution but a theory of the interaction of interdependent things on one another? That question, however, may prove on examination to be a rhetorical question—one which has the effect not of instructing the mind of the audience but of misleading it. We may best answer it by another question: is the theory of evolution anything more than a theory of the interaction of interdependent things? If

it is nothing more, it takes us no further than our starting-point, which precisely is that things, as they are given in experience, are interdependent and do interact. If it takes us no further than our starting-point, it does not even begin to move, or take one step towards viewing things not as a manifold but as a unity, not as interdependent merely but as constituting a whole. Few people, probably, at the present day will hold what many people have held in the recent past, viz. that the assumption of the uniformity of nature and the universality of the law of causation enables us to view things as constituting a whole and not as an interdependent manifold. From that point of view the state of things existing at any given moment is the necessary outcome of a state of things existing the moment before, that of a previous state of things, and so *ad infinitum*: the regress is infinite, an original state of things is inconceivable. It is of course inconceivable because, on this view, the supposed whole of things is placed in time; consequently, on this view, we have a whole of things, and over and above the whole we have also time. Thus, the supposed whole is not a whole, because it does not include time. Neither, of course, does this supposed whole include space; on the contrary it is in illimitable space. Round it,

‘boundless and bare

The lone and level sands stretch far away.’

Science, therefore, and the theory of evolution, so far as it is scientific, starts from things as they are given in our experience, that is, as things interdependent and interactive in time and space. No one, however, will suggest that the whole of things is given in our experience. Science, therefore, does not start from the whole; and, what is of more importance, she declines, from the beginning, to bind her hands by assuming either that there is a whole or that there is not. Yet the assumption that there is a whole, and that there is a unity of meaning and purpose, manifesting itself in the things which are given in our experience, is an assumption which most people make, and which they become more or less aware of, when, oppressed or crushed by the mystery of this unintelligible world, they ask ‘What does it all come to? What does it all mean?’ In such moments of questioning it appears as though the assumption were one which could never have been drawn from things as given in our experience, and which can hardly be reconciled with them.

‘What does it all come to? What does it all mean?’ is a question which may be put with regard either to one’s own

personal experience or to all that man knows. In both cases it is with reference to a whole that the question is put. In both cases, therefore, the question is one which science as yet does not profess to answer. It is a question which science as yet has scarcely learned to put, for science is abstract and deals not with reality or real things or even with things as they are presented to us, but with aspects of them, such as their number, weight, chemical constitution, etc. But if science scarcely professes to deal with any whole as a whole and attends merely to parts or aspects of the whole, it would seem natural to inquire whether we ever deal with wholes or with what we imagine to be wholes. For if we do, then perhaps we may there have either the right way, or an intimation of the right way, of approaching life and the universe. As a matter of fact, in art we have to do with wholes: a work of art claims to be a whole, self-consistent, and complete in itself; and if it fails to be so, it so far fails to be art. That any whole which is a work of art is the work of imagination, may be admitted; but, if we make the admission, we need not further admit that all analogy breaks down between the whole which is presented to us by a work of art and the whole which we assume to be presented to us—if only in interrogative form—by life or by the universe. For if a work of art be the work of imagination, still, when realised in marble or music or verse, it exists as a reality, or as a real thing in the same sense as may be ascribed to anything else that is presented to us, or to any other of our presentations. There is, therefore, in respect of reality enough resemblance between works of art and other things to make it permissible to draw an analogy between them. What the value of the analogy, when drawn, may prove to be, is another question. All that, at the outset, we are concerned with, is to recognise that experience does present us with wholes, in the form of works of art; and that possibly some analogy may exist, or at any rate may be drawn, between such wholes and the whole which is implied, when we ask of life or of the universe, 'What does it all mean? What does it all come to?'

Any work of art must be conceived in the soul of the artist before it can be executed: he must have the vision, the first fine rapture, even though he never succeeds in giving to it full utterance or adequate expression of it to the listening world. What in his vision he sees as a whole has to find expression by a series of acts or in a series of ideas. It is by a series of acts that the statuary or the cathedral architect gives expression to his vision; it is in a series of ideas—written down in notes or words—that the musician or the poet expresses

his conception. But whereas the reader must follow the series of the musician's notes or the poet's words, the spectator of the cathedral must not attend to the series of acts by which the stones were carved and placed. We may be tempted to contrast a statue, or a picture, or a cathedral with a poem, a play, or a symphony; and to say that a picture is there as a whole, capable of being grasped as a whole, without regard to time, whereas a tragedy takes time to play and an epic takes time to read. But it seems doubtful whether the contrast really holds: a cathedral cannot be seen for what it is from any one point of view, and therefore cannot be realised by the spectator save by a process which occupies time. The cathedral or the picture or the statue is then in this respect on the same footing as the play or the epic: all works of art, every artistic whole requires time alike for its production and for its appreciation: its production and its appreciation alike are processes. And both processes may be inadequate: a piece of music, or a drama, may be played badly, or a poem may be read—not aloud, but apprehended—badly. And probably great artists are rarely, if ever, permanently satisfied with the way in which they have actually bodied forth their vision, or satisfied that they have really set forth all they saw, as they saw it. For them, and still more for the lesser artists, there is the critic to point out the inner inconsistencies and the faults both of execution and of design.

But what is the work of art which to be judged fairly—indeed to be judged at all—must be judged as a whole; and which *a fortiori* must have been conceived as a whole before it was put in execution? The poem or the fugue cannot be the little black marks which are put on white paper and sent forth broadcast. There are hieroglyphics in Yucatan which no one now can read; there are people to whom a printed sheet of music is meaningless; there are voters who are illiterate. There may have been poets, there certainly were tellers of tales, long before there was an alphabet, long even before there was picture-writing. Obviously, the little black marks are not indispensable to the poem, the tale, the music, or the song. They are but means of communication between the author and his public. As means they may be superior or inferior—opinions differ—to the actors or to the singers, or to the musical instruments whereby also the dramatist or the musical composer may reveal his vision or experience to men. Evidently we must distinguish the means of communication from that which is communicated. The sculptured marble itself, or the cathedral itself, must also be regarded as a means of com-

munication: it is not that which is communicated. It is not the impression which the spectator receives, nor is it that to which its author has striven to give expression. In fine, the essence of the work is precisely that which the physical eye does not see, nor the ear hear. Ear and eye, as much as the printed page and the spoken word, are but means whereby the message travels: they are no part of the message. If we compare them to the receiver at the end of a telephonic wire, then behind them must stand the souls, which alone can utter and understand the message. A soul alone can conceive or receive a message: the message, as a message, cannot exist save in some soul; and if it is to be understood, it must be received as it was conceived—as a whole.

The recipient of a message may doubt whether he understands it aright: this part of it may appear inconsistent with the rest; one method of interpretation may put a meaning on most of the message and leave the rest obscure. But the only satisfactory method of interpretation will be a method which interprets the whole. The readers of *Hamlet* may, and some do, ask 'What does it all come to? What does it all mean?' The assumption is that the whole has a meaning, and that only in the light of the whole can any part be properly understood. The same assumption is made by those who seek to read the riddle of the universe, and to understand its meaning. It is an assumption the same in kind as that made by every man who is rung up on the telephone: he assumes that the sentences coming over the wire will, when the last has reached him, make an intelligible whole. He assumes that the speaker is a rational being, and that what is coming over the wire is not a mere plurality of words but a connected whole of thought. But his assumption may be false: what is coming over the wire may be, or may appear to be, a string of disjointed words or a series of sentences which do not make an intelligible whole. This much, however, is certain: whether his assumption be true or false, it is the only assumption on which there is any possibility of understanding the message if it has a meaning, if it be a message. It is the only hypothesis which will work. That is a truth which would not be in the least impaired even if we were to admit that as yet it has not worked at all—an admission which neither the scientific mind nor the religious mind will consent to make. Further, the hypothesis is that the universe, the whole, has a meaning. The hypothesis is fundamentally misconceived, or rather it is abandoned—unconsciously perhaps, but none the less really abandoned—if it be supposed that the whole has no meaning as a whole, that

the sentences which make up the message may have meaning but the message has none. That is simply to relapse into the opposite hypothesis, the hypothesis which will not work, that the message is not a message but a string of disjointed words which constitute no whole and make no meaning.

Let us then stick to the one hypothesis which will work, viz. that the universe is a whole, having meaning as a whole. Then it follows that an understanding of the whole is necessary for a comprehension of any of the parts: the function or meaning of any part of an organism can only be understood provided that we know the organism as a whole. The foot or wing of an animal cannot be understood save with reference to the structure of the animal as a whole and to the environment of the animal; nor can the limb even exist save as a part of a whole. Then, whether we compare the knowledge we are, from generation to generation, acquiring of the universe to a message that is coming over a wire; or whether we abstain from the metaphor of a message and adopt the theory of the evolution of the universe; in either case it is conceded that the whole—whether the whole message or the whole story of the universe—is not before us. The universe as a whole may have meaning; but the whole is precisely that which is not given in our experience. To say, therefore, that no part can be understood save with reference to the whole is to say simply that no part can be, or is, understood by us—and to say so is an extravagance. It is an extravagance, too, which leads us still further afield: if no part of the message can be understood by us until the whole is delivered, neither can it be understood by anybody—the words ‘by us’ are superfluous and misleading, the message is intelligible to nobody, that is to say, it is no message at all. Or, if we drop the metaphor of the message, we must say that evolution, so long as it is in process, not merely is unintelligible but has no meaning: it will only have a meaning when the process is over and when ‘time shall be no more.’

Thus, in the very terms both of the metaphor of the message and of the theory of evolution, the whole is not and cannot be before us: for us the whole is non-existent and must always be so. Here, however, we may possibly get some assistance, if we turn once more to a field of experience in which—perhaps in which alone—we do find wholes existing, the field of art. That which the artist strives to communicate to his fellow-men, whether by means of sound, as the poet and the musician does, or by means of sight, as the painter, the statuary or the cathedral builder does, is something conceived by him, or disclosed

to him, as a whole. It is not necessary for the purpose of this argument, and perhaps not necessary at all, to assume that the whole as conceived by him in the first fine rapture is the whole as he eventually strives to give it to the world. We may speak of it as being from the first an organic whole, and as having, therefore, the potentiality of organic growth. It may, and probably it must, pass through successive stages of developement: the kernel of a drama may unfold its various scenes in the mind of the dramatist, though not in the order in which eventually he gives them forth. But it is the drama as a whole which develops itself in every part: the whole is not at any point of its history made up by fitting together parts which existed previous to the whole and independent of it. Organisms are not put together that way; nor have we any reason to think that the universe, regarded as an organic whole, is being, or has been, so constructed. Be that as it may, the work of art is from its beginning a whole, and grows as a whole. Or, rather we should say, may grow; for it may not grow to its full growth—it may be cut untimely off. ‘Weir of Hermiston’ was so cut off—by abhorred shears. Are we then to suppose that it never existed as a whole in the mind of R. L. Stevenson, that is to say, that it never existed as a whole at all? The suggestion we should offer is that it, like every other real work of art, exists really in the maker’s mind, and in the minds of others so far as they can enter into his. The means of communication between his mind and theirs may be broken off or interrupted, as a telephone wire may be, with the result that the message is cut off in the middle. But the break does not constitute any presumption that there was no whole of meaning in process of transmission. The reader of ‘Weir of Hermiston’ is quite sure that a whole of meaning was in process of transmission, even though he does not know and will never know what that whole precisely was, and, therefore, can never decide with certainty what the exact bearing of any part may be.

In the same way, we may regard the universe not only as a whole but as a whole of meaning. We may regard the meaning as in the process of transmission, and the process as going on and not yet complete, just as every message that comes over the telephone is incomplete as long as it is coming. But though it is undeniable that the message, as long as it is coming, is incomplete, it is equally undeniable that it is a whole in the mind of the sender before he can transmit it. The fact, therefore, that the whole is not and cannot be before us constitutes no presumption that the universe is not a whole of meaning. It shows that we do not and cannot appreciate to any great

extent any part of it ; it does not show that we have no understanding whatever of such chapters as have been published. We can at least divine some rational connexion between them, even though we cannot see how poetic justice is going to be worked out. We treat the message as being a message to us, and as being a message which it concerns us to understand ; men's actions are affected by the interpretations they put upon it. And the various interpretations are in effect the various religions of the world. From this point of view, the message is one with which we may comply or not : it is the announcement of a will or purpose which we may, if we choose, make our own. But the message may also from this point of view be regarded as the announcement of something preordained and fixed, so that we have no choice of action and cannot choose what we will do : we are simply instruments and means, by which or through which the end is to be accomplished. The message is through us : but it is not to us, any more than the telephone message is a message to the wire over which it runs. The difficulty of reconciling pre-ordination with free-will is indeed the difficulty of understanding how we can be at once ends and means, how the message can be at once through us and to us. There is the same difficulty about understanding the possibility of motion ; and to say *solvitur ambulando* does not solve the difficulty but simply shows that the difficulty is not a practical one, and that the easiest of things to do may be one of the most difficult of things to explain or understand. In the same way the difficulty, or the impossibility, of understanding how we can be at once both ends and means—as we are, in all our dealings with our fellow-men—does not alter the fact. On the contrary, if it were not the fact, there would be nothing to explain, and the difficulty of explaining or understanding it would not arise.

It is as members of a society, as parts of a whole, that we are at once both ends and means : ends from our own point of view, means in the calculation of others. The whole of life and of the world, however, is not and cannot be before us. If it is not and cannot be before us as a whole, we cannot from it have got the conception of a whole. Wholes, however—if only wholes of imagination—are presented to us by art ; and it may therefore be worth while to consider whether such wholes can help us to understand what, however unintelligible, is the fact, viz. that we are, in our daily life and trivial round, both ends and means. That fact is postulated by those who imagine that the message of the universe is transmitted both to us and through us, that the whole of purpose, contemplated

by the divine will, may be and is being realised in and by the action of free agents.

Let us turn therefore once more to the quarter in which we do find wholes which have some reality, even though—or possibly because—they exist in the soul of the artist and also exist, it may be to a lesser degree, in the souls of those with whom, by means of things visible or audible, he manages to establish communication.

The sculptor or the painter deals with material things or means over which he has a control which is not absolute indeed, but is sufficient for his purposes ; he is an artist in proportion as he so controls them. The orator deals in words, in audible sounds ; and he may be said to make speeches, as the sculptor may be said to make statues. But the sculpture, or the painting, or the poem, though it may be regarded as an end in itself, as it is when people talk of 'art for art's sake,' may also, and more properly, be regarded as the means whereby the artist seeks to convey to others the vision he himself has had ; and he seeks the means in the conviction that, could he find them, had the poet but the skill to reproduce what he is hearkening to, 'the world should listen then, as I am listening now' ; the orator, like the poet, uses speech, because he must : in no other way can he effect his end. In the case of the poet, his end is to communicate his vision and emotion to others and to make them listen, as he is listening now. In the case of the orator, the end is more comprehensive : it is not only to communicate his vision of a Hellas free from Philip, and to make his hearers share in his emotion, as the poet strives to make the world hear what he heard, and feel what he felt. The orator's end is to make his hearers act. It is not speeches—or not merely speeches—that the orator makes : he makes—or his end is to make—real people do what he wants. And this he does by getting them to adopt his views, to make his object theirs, to make his will their own. He speaks to them and acts through them : they are at once both means and ends, the material on which and the instrument with which he acts. But the material is living material, the instruments are living agents ; and it is only on the assumption—if it be but a tacit or even the unconscious assumption—of their freedom of will that he can set to work to persuade them, or that there is any necessity to persuade them. The orator is an artist and uses persuasion ; the tyrant is not and uses force—and he is forced to use it because his victims are free to resist if they choose. They are not, that is to say, means alone ; no tyrant can make them so ; and no orator can treat them so.

It may be said, however, and perhaps with justice, that we are not entitled to regard oratory as one of the arts, at any rate when our purpose is to consider wholes of imagination and to inquire whether they help us to understand how we can be both ends and means, how the message of the universe can be transmitted both to us and through us, or how agents, in realising a will not their own, may yet be free. Of oratory on the one hand, and of art on the other, we may perhaps justly say what Shelley says of the difference of a story and a poem : 'the one is partial, and applies only to a definite period of time, and a certain combination of events which can never again recur ; the other is universal, and contains within itself the germ of a relation to whatever motions or actions have place in the possible varieties of human nature.' An oration, viewed in its place as a fact in history, does indeed apply only to a definite period of time and to events which can never again recur. It is not therefore a whole of imagination or a whole of art : it is a part of history, and, like a part of anything else whatever, it has but a partial and incomplete existence when separated from the whole to which it belongs. A drama, on the other hand, as contrasted with an oration, is a whole—not merely a self-consistent, but a self-subsistent, whole. Like an oration, however, it applies to a definite period of time—if of imaginary time, i.e. of a time which has no before or after—and if the tragedy resembles the oration, in that it deals with a certain combination of events which can never again recur, it is decisively distinguished in that the events of the tragedy never happened at all : they are of imagination all compact. They are of themselves a whole : the events to which the speech applies are not, they are but parts or points of time. The oration itself has its place in time. Time has its place within the tragedy, for the play, if a whole of imagination, is still a whole, for events which are supposed to precede, or surmised to follow, those represented on the stage are still within the tragedy, still parts of the whole presented by the imagination to the imagination. It is only within a whole—whether a whole of imagination or a whole of reality—that time and events in time are possible. If the time be never ending and the events be infinite in number, as the subdivision of a unit may be supposed carried *ad infinitum*, the events are still parts of the whole. We may not be able to see the whole for the parts—or the forest for the trees—but, for all that, there would be no parts if there were no whole, there would be no acts if there were no play. And there would be no actors either.

A play, then, like the universe to which we belong, is a whole, having its time within it : neither the microcosm to which the characters belong, nor the macrocosm in which we, men and women, play our parts, is itself in time. Each as a whole is complete in itself ; and, if we distinguish either whole into parts, those parts have reference, and by their nature can only have reference, to one another or to the whole. If we distinguish those parts as temporal, i.e. as events in time, their reference is necessarily to one another, to points within the whole : they cannot have temporal reference to any event outside the whole, for beyond the whole there is nothing.

The actions of the characters in the play must be natural, that is to say, they must be the actions which real men and women in the circumstances depicted would be likely to perform : they must not be actions which the playwright puts them through, just for the sake of his plot, but which no real man or woman would be likely to perform under the circumstances. The plot must be the actions, viewed as a whole, and the actions, taken together, must form the plot. If the plot falls away from the actions or the actions from the plot, in such a manner as to reveal that the connexion between them is inconsequential, the play is felt to be unsatisfactory ; and it is unsatisfactory simply because the actions and plot do not form a whole. The finger of the playwright is visible in his attempt to put together things which do not form a whole. What the characters do must not be dictated to them by the playwright. They must be free, or else they are unreal. They must do what they do, for the same reason as real persons, viz. because they choose to do it : if they do it for some other reason, viz. because the playwright makes them do it for purposes of his own, that is for the purposes of his plot, their action is found by the spectator unnatural and unconvincing. The characters then are not real characters but puppets, and the strings are visible. If the characters on the other hand impress us as real, we feel that what they did was their own doing ; and at the same time we see, when we come to look back upon the play, that their actions make one whole and conduce to one end, not conceived or foreseen by them ; and that end was the purpose of the author from the moment when the tragedy was conceived by him, or disclosed to his imagination as the vision of a whole, a whole of art. It is that whole which manifests itself in the characters of the play and in what they do. In each succeeding scene from the first rise of the curtain to its final fall, the whole permeates every part ; and the only danger which attaches to saying that the whole determines

every part is the danger of imagining that the whole is separate from the parts. That danger arises, of course, from the fact that the play takes time to read, and that in the first instance we make acquaintance with the parts before the whole : from such first acquaintance we must distinguish the true knowledge of the play which enables us to see that the parts have no existence independent of the whole. The whole is the reality ; and it is only as parts of the whole that the parts are real.

If now the characters in any play were real, if the characters in 'Othello,' from being characters and parts of a whole of imagination, became real men and women, making up a whole of reality, they would act in the way the creatures of Shakespeare's imagination are represented as acting ; and, acting so, they would act of their own free-will ; and by so doing they would carry out the purpose of their author. That purpose permeates the whole ; without a purpose there would be no whole ; and, if there were no whole, there could be no parts. It is by acting of their own free-will that men and women carry out the purpose of the whole, just as it is by their own free-will and in their own free actions that the characters of 'Othello' realise or manifest the purpose of the whole. But there would be no parts if there were not a whole, and that a whole of purpose.

The play-goer, or the reader of 'Othello,' the first time he sees or reads the play, does not know how it is going to turn out. The characters, if they ceased to be creatures of the imagination and became creatures of flesh and blood, would equally be ignorant. What has happened up to any given moment they know at that moment. What the whole is, what its meaning and purpose may be, they do not and at the moment cannot know. Time is the condition of their ignorance, and of ours : so long or so far as we are in time, we are ignorant of the whole, its meaning and its purpose. To know the whole, as we know 'Othello' as a whole, we must be outside the time represented in the play ; we must even be outside the time spent in becoming acquainted with the play.

A play, 'Othello' for instance, as we have already said, is not the little black marks on paper, whereby we read it ; nor is it even the voice and gestures whereby the actors convey it to our understanding. It exists in the mind of him who conceived it and in the minds of those who understand it : it exists in a mind or minds, or else it does not exist at all. There it is real because it is a whole, and a whole because it is real. The means, whereby the whole of imagination which we know as 'Othello' is communicated from mind to mind, are no part of the

play, or of its reality as a play; and if we were betrayed into saying that the reality of the play was the only reality, we should be compelled to maintain or admit that the printed edition, or that the actors were not real. The alternative is to admit that the play and the means of its communication are both real, unless we are prepared to say that the means of communication—the actors or the printed page—are real but that which is communicated is not.

When then we invite ourselves to imagine the characters of 'Othello' becoming real men and women, what degree of reality are we to suppose left to the whole to which they belong? or are we to allow it any? The actors, by the supposition, are no longer merely actors but real men and women: that is to say, they are both the means by which the communication is made and the communication itself. In Shelley's words, 'they become at once the representation and the medium, the pencil and the picture, the chisel and the statue, the chord and the harmony.' Indeed, more than this, they become the souls to whom the picture is presented, the statue visible, and by whom the harmony is heard. The representation and the medium, the communication and the means thereof, the harmony and the soul aware of it, become all realities of the same degree. But by the supposition they become realities manifesting themselves in time, and therefore realities which at no moment of time manifest themselves as wholes, but always as parts. The melody may be sweetly played in tune, but it is not played out. That so much of it as reaches us, or so much of it as we ourselves perform, is part of a whole, and prefigures it, men generally do not and cannot doubt. A symphony is a whole even before it is played out; and such reality as the successive parts have, they have because they are parts of a whole. The fact that, as long as the world-drama is being played, the whole is not before us, does not avail to make us doubt the reality of the whole. But neither does it permit us to believe that we have knowledge of the whole because we have imperfect experience of a part.

That reality is assumed by us to be a whole is shown by the question which arises from time to time in most minds with respect to life or the world, viz. 'What does it all mean? What does it all come to?' On the answer which we give to that question depends the attitude which we, as parts of the whole, shall take, or the relation which we shall be found to bear, to the whole. One relation there is, the time-relation, which bears between the parts, and which we may be tempted to try to find existing between the parts and the whole. If we make the

attempt, then we may assume the whole to exist before the parts, as a whole of art exists in the vision of the artist before he realises it in marble or in verse. Or we may assume the parts to exist before the whole, as the successive scenes in a play are presented to the spectator before he comes to realise the whole. Or, again, we may assume the whole to exist at any moment in the parts just so far as the parts themselves have come into existence at that moment. All three of these assumptions take it for granted that a relation, the time-relation, which exists between one part and another, can and must equally exist between a part and the whole: either the whole exists in time before the parts, or the parts exist in time before the whole, or the whole never exists as a whole, that is to say, never exists at all. Thus the outcome of the assumption that a time-relation exists between the parts and the whole, as it does between one part and another, is either that the whole did at some moment of past time exist prior to and therefore independently of its parts, in which case it was not a whole of parts, and therefore not a whole at all. Or else the parts existed and the whole did not, in which case there was no whole for them to be parts of, and so they were not parts at all. Or else the whole at no moment of time exists, and then there can be no parts at any time. Whatever then the relation between the parts and the whole may be, it cannot be a time-relation. The parts may be in time: the whole cannot be. The relation of the parts to one another may be a temporal-relation; the relation of the parts to the whole cannot be. This fact is evidently comprehended in the religious conception of God: He is not in time, and our relation to Him is not a temporal-relation. Neither can He be in space nor can our relation to Him be a spatial relation. The parts may be in space; the whole cannot be.

If we assume, as most of us, at some time or other, consciously or semi-consciously do assume, that there is a whole which is real and is the whole of reality, we must then, to be consistent, admit that the parts cannot exist independently of the whole, nor the whole exist independently of the parts. But the existence of a whole of reality is an assumption: it is not an inference from the things of experience, as they are given in experience. As given, they are interdependent and interact on one another in time and space; and such interaction and interdependence afford not the least ground for inferring that they constitute a whole of reality. It is equally susceptible of the supposition that things are boundless and illimitable, like the time and space in which they are found. But the

things of experience do not point to either supposition as an inference which is to be drawn in preference to the other. The supposition that reality is a whole is not an inference which we draw or can draw from experience: it is a conception which we apply to it, a way in which alone it is possible ultimately to understand experience. The ultimate object in the pursuit of knowledge is the whole of knowledge and knowledge of the whole. But to say that it is the ultimate object aimed at is to admit that it cannot be the first result to be attained. Of this the earliest Greek philosophers and men of science were ignorant: they aimed first at knowledge of the whole. This error in the method of procedure has been corrected by modern men of science. They have recognised that they must attack the problem not as a whole but in detail. And as long as they so attack the problem their contribution to its solution can consist of details only. The error which besets them is that, immersed in details, they sometimes forget that those details have neither value nor reality, unless knowledge, like reality, be—or be assumed to be—a whole. Science is content to accept the manifold of experience as a manifold, and to study what is given in it without assuming that it will ultimately prove to be a whole. And so long as it is regarded as a manifold, it cannot be regarded as a whole. The moment we choose to regard it as a whole, we look upon it as something other than a manifold. If we look upon it as a whole, then we may consistently consider it to have parts interdependent and interacting on one another; and we may legitimately seek to interpret things as parts of a whole. But if we start, as science starts, by refusing to regard things as parts of a whole, then, if we are consistent, to the end we must maintain our refusal. We may analyse, and analyse them into molecules, atoms, and electrons, and yet the process of analysis will remain undone. Or we may recognise that things are interdependent, and then we may trace their interaction on one other in time and space; and still the process of synthesis will be incomplete, until time and space shall be no more. No whole is ever made by synthesis; no reality is ever reached by analysis.

It is from experience, as it is given, that we must start: and we may start in either of two ways. We may assume that what is given is a manifold, or we may assume that it is the manifestation of a whole. Both are alike assumptions. But that is no reason for confusing them. If what is imperfectly disclosed to us in experience is a whole of parts, then it is not a manifold of things which constitute no whole. If it is a manifold of things which have no unity, it is not a whole.

We may assume it to be either : we cannot assume it to be both, as Mr. Keary appears to do when he says that a manifold is really a unity. What is given in experience may be regarded at one time as a manifold and at another as a unity. But the two ways of looking at it are different ways ; and nothing but confusion can ensue from imagining that the different ways are not different ways. Not even the fact that the same thing is looked at will make the two ways one. It may of course well be that Mr. Keary would accept all this, and would say that what at any given moment of experience appears a manifold is really a unity and a whole. But in that case we should have been grateful if he had told us in what sense exactly he uses the word ' whole.' When, by way of illustration, he takes from experience such a scene as that which he describes in the passage cited from him at the beginning of this article, he is amply justified, by the ordinary use of language, in speaking of such a scene as a whole. But even if such a scene may be spoken of as a whole of experience, such a scene nevertheless is not the whole of experience, or the whole of reality. In experience we are presented with many such scenes : experience is made up or consists of such scenes. If therefore each such scene is a whole, then the whole of experience is not made up of parts but of wholes ; whereas it is essential to the very conception of a whole that it consists of parts, and obvious that no scene of experience can be itself a whole. If one scene of experience, taken apart from its context, can rightly be termed a whole, then any part of that scene may be taken, *in abstracto*, apart from its context, and be rightly taken as a whole.

In consistency therefore Mr. Keary would be ready to admit that, as no part of the scene can be a whole, so no scene of experience can be the whole of experience ; and this, pushed to its logical conclusion, means that there can be only one whole—that of which all things whatever are the interdependent parts—and nothing can be rightly understood which is taken *in abstracto* ; much less can anything possibly exist *in abstracto*, apart from the one and only whole. It would seem then that in the course of experience we are continually coming across things or scenes which at first we pronounce, off-hand, to be wholes, and which on reflection we see not to be wholes, but to be parts which we have taken *in abstracto* and have imagined, falsely, to be wholes. But when we once commence this movement of thought, when we once set out in search of a whole, there is only one point at which we can stop, and that is precisely the point which we can never reach—the whole. In face of this forbidding fact, that we can never, whether by

experience or knowledge, attain to the whole, it is little to be wondered at that many people not merely renounce the quest but deny the assumption on which alone it is possible to enter on the quest, the assumption that there is any such whole. It seems so much easier and safer to start from the admitted fact of the interaction and interdependence of things; and it seems quite possible so to start without making the counter-assumption that there is no whole of reality. But this positivist and scientific refusal to make either the assumption or the counter-assumption is rarely adhered to; and what makes in favour of the counter-assumption is the fact that it fits without difficulty into the ordinary conception of time. In time things may interact *ad infinitum*; and things which interact *ad infinitum* cannot form a whole. Hence, when a man of science turns to philosophy and, like M. Bergson, shows himself a great philosopher, he may throw over the reality of space, but he retains the reality of time and builds his system upon it. Or when a great psychologist turns to philosophy, as Mr. William James did, he takes up the position that reality is in the making, and that the process of making takes place in time. Thus, from eternity to eternity reality is in the making, but at no time has it been, or will it ever be, made. In time there can be no whole. If, differing from Mr. James and M. Bergson, we choose, or cannot help but choose, to believe that all things are parts of one whole, then that whole must include time, as well as other things.

In his chapter dealing with pragmatism Mr. Keary remarks on 'the psychologising tendency of contemporary thought'; and Mr. Bertrand Russell in his essay on pragmatism also notes that with the pragmatists 'psychology is paramount over 'logic and the theory of knowledge.' And when we remember that Mr. William James, the chief apostle of pragmatism, was a psychologist before he became a pragmatist, we may be disposed to believe that the relationship, which both Mr. Russell and Mr. Keary point out, between psychology and pragmatism, is not merely accidental. Mr. Keary, indeed, goes further: 'pragmatism,' he says, 'is a child of positivism'; and, in so far as positivism is the position that science alone affords positive knowledge, we shall agree with Mr. Keary. The starting-point of science, as we have said already, is the interaction of things upon one another in time; and such interaction does not require us to assume that the universe is a whole. Science can get started and can go on for ever, without having to make any such assumption. And, as the interaction takes place in time, it follows that neither what

has happened, nor what is yet to happen, has any existence : what has happened exists no longer, what has yet to happen has as yet no existence. In fine, on this view, a thing must happen, if it is to be in any sense : the only being is happening. Those on the other hand to whom it seems obvious that a thing must be—otherwise it could not happen—will at the beginning dissent from the notion that the happening takes place, and is the only reality that occurs or exists. Science however declines to enter on any such question as whether matter exists ; and confines itself exclusively to the modes and laws of its behaviour, for the purpose of discovering what actually happens under given conditions. It is with the happening of things that science is concerned. Psychology, as a science, limits itself in exactly the same way : with the mind, or soul, or subject, or self, it is not concerned, but solely with what goes on in the mind—the happenings that take place, the interaction and interpenetration of the state of consciousness. Thus the man of science and the psychologist do not either ask or answer the question whether things exist as well as happen, or whether the mind not only performs actions but also exists. Those questions are left over by science. But it is open to anyone else who comes along to offer such answer as he thinks fit. One such answer is that a thing is what it does ; and that is often accepted as settling the matter, and as showing that the actions done, that is to say, the happenings, with which alone science is concerned, are the only realities which exist, or which, we should rather say, occur. This answer often is, or has been, commended to common sense by the representation that science is simply clarified common sense ; it just deals with things as they occur, and submits its conclusions to the test of experience ; if it says that a certain thing happens in a certain way, anyone may test the assertion for himself, and see for himself whether it does. And the common-sense man, seeing that the event does happen as described, falls into the fallacy of thinking that the happening is the only fact that there is to take into account. Thus he is juggled out of half his real property, i.e. out of his common-sense knowledge that things both act and are, and could not act if they were not.

The side of pragmatism to which most attention has been given is that on which it exhibits a new theory of truth ; and that is where we may see pragmatism basing itself on the position that the happening of an event is the reality with which we have to deal. Truth itself, like every other reality, is a happening : 'truth happens,' in Mr. William James's words, 'to ideas.' Truth, he says, 'is in fact an event, a

'process.' Truth, like reality, is in the making: nothing, not even truth, is. In this view, to say all things happen is going too far, if it is taken to imply that things exist as well as happen: the happening alone exists and is real, the things are not real and do not exist. So, too, the happenings which go on in the mind are real, but not the mind itself: the mind is what it does, and the interaction and interpenetration of conscious states is what actually goes on. And yet, we may suggest, though this conclusion may be presented to the common-sense man as being what he believes, it is not what common sense believes, or can believe. Common sense will not believe that truth is simply what 'furthers our purposes,' or 'pays,' or 'works.' Nor will it believe that anything can happen, if nothing is. Still less will it believe that reality in no sense is, and that happenings alone take place, or are in process of taking place. Common sense may, quite well, be wrong on all these points; but to represent that science, including psychology, is but clarified common sense, and that therefore the further philosophical conclusions drawn from science are but common sense still further clarified, would be simply a misrepresentation. And the reason is fairly plain: science confines itself to the interaction of things and abjures the idea that there is a whole, whereas common sense believes in the reality of things and believes vaguely that they are parts of a whole, though it never works out either belief to its logical conclusion. That is the task of philosophy; and to begin by ruling out the beliefs of common sense is to begin the task of philosophy at the wrong end. It is better to begin the pursuit of reason, as Mr. Keary does, with that experience of the man in the fields, in which from the first moment we catch at any rate a glimpse of the whole, after which philosophy follows, faint but pursuing. And it is well to remember, though without discouragement, that 'though a wise man think to know it, yet shall he not be able to find it,' for, if he were able, then of making many books there would be an end.

ART. V.—THE HISTORICAL MONUMENTS OF GREAT
BRITAIN AND THEIR ILLUSTRATION IN HERT-
FORDSHIRE AND BERWICKSHIRE.

1. *Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England) and Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Hertfordshire.* Anno Domini MCMX
2. *The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions of Scotland. First Report and Inventory of Monuments and Constructions in the County of Berwick. Second Report Monuments and Constructions in the County of Sutherland. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty.*
3. *First Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inventory the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions of Wales and Monmouthshire. And to specify those which seem most worthy of preservation. From the appointment of the Commission to the 31st December 1909.*
4. *The Care of Ancient Monuments.* By G. BALDWIN BROWN, M.A., Cambridge, at the University Press. 1905.
5. *Vanishing England.* By P. H. DITCHFIELD. London: Methuen and Co. 1910.

THE recent publication of the first report of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments in England reminds us of the considerable change in public opinion in regard to the preservation of national memorials which has taken place in the last quarter of a century. It is, however, a change which is not marked by any public enthusiasm, but is chiefly noticeable for energetic efforts on the part of a section of the more cultured classes backed by a quiet public approval. People have not had to put their hands in their pockets, and many persons have accordingly not thwarted the effort of those determined to preserve archaeological monuments which have remained to our generation. A recognition of the propriety of the preservation of memorials illustrative of national progress in times past by the Government as representing the nation was long in being obtained, and Lord Avebury told the House of Lords on the second reading of the Ancient Monuments Protection Bill in 1900, that constantly between 1871 and 1882 fruitless attempts had been vainly made to obtain the assistance of the State in the preservation of national memo-

rials. This period of disappointment was however ended by the passing of the Ancient Monuments Protection Act 1882, which marks the conclusion of State non-interference, and is the just recognition by the State of the propriety of preserving a certain number of national monuments. For the basis of this Act is to be found in the Schedule of antiquarian remains at the end of the statute, which contains twenty-nine in England and Wales, twenty-one in Scotland and eighteen in Ireland. These monuments of the past were of a limited class and chiefly consisted of tumuli, earthworks, and stones. By this Act the owner of any one of these memorials was given the right to appoint the Commissioners of Works as the guardian of it, though this power could be revoked by a succeeding owner. While it lasted, however, the Commissioners of Works could maintain the monument entrusted to them; in other words, could spend public money on its preservation and could preserve it from injury. Finally, an inspector of ancient monuments was appointed. This statute was typical of English legislation—it was tentative and timid, and, though a recognition of a principle, was but a partial application of it. Eighteen years elapsed before any further legislative action was taken to safeguard the monuments of England and Wales which were not mentioned in the Act of 1882. Meanwhile, however, in 1892 a statute of a more extended scope was passed in reference to Ireland, an Act which would never even have been introduced had not there been under the Irish Church Act a sum of £50,000 available for the preservation of monuments of historic or architectural interest. The English Act of 1900, which followed, was, in fact, no more than an extension of the Irish Act of 1892 to England, Wales, and Scotland. It greatly increased the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of Works, for when they were of opinion that the preservation of any monument was a matter of public interest by reason of its historic, traditional, or artistic interest, they could at the request of the owner become its guardian. But now also, and for the first time, County Councils were introduced and they were empowered not only to become at the request of an owner guardians of a monument, but also to contribute to its maintenance, a privilege which we believe has been seldom acted on. The principle of introducing the local authority was clearly sound, because, valuable and interesting as are many memorials to be found all over England, they are often rather of local than general interest. That is to say as elements of locality they form part of its history and so contribute to the history of the nation as a whole. Some

it is true are of such transcendent value that they may be regarded as primarily national ; such, for example, are the cathedrals from Canterbury to Durham whose importance is at once recognised as national rather than local, and whose loss or injury would be rightly considered as a national misfortune. For the most part, however, English monuments may fairly be entrusted to the guardianship of the chief local authority, the County Council, for anything in the nature of the rigidly regulated and bureaucratic system of France is neither desirable, nor, having regard to English characteristics, practicable.

But the legislation which culminated in the Act of 1900 was obviously incomplete until the ground of its action had been accurately and authoritatively ascertained, and the work, whether of the Commissioners of Works or of the local authority, was hampered until the objects of it were definitely ascertained. The appointment in October 1908 of a Royal Commissioner to make

‘ an inventory of the Ancient and Historical Monuments connected with or illustrative of the contemporary culture, civilisation, and conditions of life of the people in England from the earliest time to the year 1700 and to specify those which seem most worthy of preservation,’

was a logical sequel to previous legislation. The appointment of the English Commission was a little later in point of time than that of the Scotch Commission which occurred in the previous February, and of that of the Welsh Commission which was made in the previous August. The appointments, however, for practical purposes, may be regarded as contemporaneous and as resulting from the same growth of public opinion. When the task of these Commissions is finished there will exist a list of national and local monuments which, in spite of losses, will enumerate a series of works of immense interest and importance. Yet, there will be one regrettable hiatus—we have now left the eighteenth century a long way behind, and many of the buildings of that age, such, for example as numerous houses at Bath, are essentially illustrative of the culture and civilisation of the age. Under the terms of the reference, the buildings of the eighteenth century will not be officially enumerated, and there will be risk of their destruction, and we cannot but think therefore that the commission should have its powers extended so as to embrace the eighteenth century.

We have now briefly considered the progress of the movement in England, so far as regards Governmental action, and the

preceding sketch shows the practical steps which have been taken in recent years to safeguard national monuments. In this respect Great Britain has moved more slowly than either France or Germany. In France the protection of monuments formed part of the creed of many great writers at the beginning of the nineteenth century—of Montalembert, Chateaubriand, Victor Hugo—it was in fact a literary movement having its origin in the reaction following on the destruction wrought by the French Revolution. In Germany, on the other hand, the movement sprang from a recognition of the importance of visible facts as illustrative of history and art. And it is largely a more modern and realistic conception of history in this country that has of late caused some changes in public opinion, which are coincident with other changes which it would be commonplace to reiterate—they are everywhere visible. But a determination to keep intact ancient national memorials is an indication of a sound national feeling. True national pride has no sufficient basis either in the things of the present or in the expectation of the future—its chief foundation is the past—‘les longs souvenirs font les grands peuples,’ and the remembrance of the past can best be kept alive by the preservation of the works, however small, of preceding generations. A Roman coin from St. Albans, a rude piece from Colchester stamped with the effigy of Cymbeline, are more stimulating to the student than mere literary description. A lively interest in any kind of construction which belongs to a past age is in fact a sign of a national perception of the real sources of national satisfaction. The movement as it is seen now in Great Britain is not supported only by amateurs and archaeologists, it is obviously based on a considerable national opinion. ‘Some of the most urgent pleas for protection,’ says Professor Baldwin Brown, ‘come now not from professed amateurs of the beautiful, but from men of affairs, and from active civic officials who are alarmed at the sacrifices which are being made on every side to the exigencies of the present.’ This was written more than five years ago, and the tendency of public opinion which is noted in these words is now stronger and more apparent. Few educated or responsible persons would to-day be found to deny the propriety of preserving everything which illustrates history, and it is only in the application of the principle in which differences exist. This difference is of course a matter of great practical importance, but the fact that the principle of preservation is now generally accepted is a singularly significant feature in the intellectual history of the country.

After these general considerations it is time to refer to the report of June 1910 of the English and Scotch Commissions, the latter on the county of Berwick, and to the report in February last on Sutherlandshire. There was also issued in July 1910 a report from the Welsh Commission, to be followed by an inventory of the county of Montgomery. These reports are of a national character, and it is somewhat to be regretted that they are not similar in form and arrangement. The English report is graced by many interesting photographs, which are denied to the other reports, except that on the county of Sutherland. But if St. Albans Abbey is portrayed, which is in no danger, why not Dryburgh Abbey, which is a frail ruin? Again, whilst the English reports have one schedule of monuments specially worthy of preservation, the Scotch report has two schedules; the first enumerating monuments and constructions specially in need of protection, the second containing a list of monuments deserving protection, but not in imminent risk of demolition or decay—a division of considerable practical value. Again, in the English report is a glossary of architectural and antiquarian terms, which, excellent in a technical handbook, is rather out of place in a report such as that to which it is appended. These criticisms are not intended to depreciate the admirable work of the three Commissions, but to suggest that as each is engaged on a common national undertaking, the results of their labours should be stated in a common form.

The report on Berwickshire touches on many noteworthy edifices, but its chief interest is centred on Dryburgh Abbey, the beautiful ruins of which are referred to not only in the body of the report, but in a separate appendix, from which it is evident that the time has come when their preservation demands careful attention.

It would be difficult to find a greater contrast than there is between the memorials of Berwickshire and Hertfordshire. While, of course, this is to be expected, it does not make the difference less vivid as an illustration of the social life of past times. Throughout the Inventory of Berwickshire the eye constantly meets with descriptions of castellated structures and defensive constructions—exemplifying in nearly every parish the wild and warlike life of a border county. The latter form of defence belongs no doubt to an earlier period than do the castles and the protected domestic buildings, though, after all, these are nothing more than works of the same character, made for the same purpose in an age of greater civilisation—the nature of the people was still the same, and

it was the same in the farmhouse, the mansion and the castle. Of castles, or, more strictly, fortified domestic buildings, there are many examples—Cockburnspath Tower, Fast Castle, Cowdenknowes, Nisbet House, and many another recall with singular force the turbulent life of northern landowners. Each has some difference, one such as Fast Castle, perched on a promontory of rock projecting into the sea, was essentially a fortress.

‘The platform on which the castle stood is 260 feet long by 88 feet broad. The neck of the promontory has been traversed by a deep trench or chasm 20 feet wide, on the castle side of which are still observable the remains of a round tower. Within, part of the E. wall of the keep still remains as high as the corbelling, with two corbels *in situ*, but all the rest of the structure is completely destroyed. The scanty remains of the battlement which encircled the promontory still exist below the edge of the precipitous cliffs on the W. side.’

Another, such as Nisbet House, was once the protected home of an important family, sufficiently defensive in construction to resist marauders. It

‘is an oblong building with a round tower at each extremity of the S. front, with two square towers containing the staircases on the N. side. The main block measures 70 feet in length by 28 feet in breadth. Above the original entrance (now built up) on the N. side is a panel bearing the coat of arms of the Kerrs. On a chevron, three stars with a crescent for difference in the dexter chief, with the motto FORWARD, and the initials I. K. twice repeated. The house is said to have been built by Sir Alexander Nisbet of that ilk in the reign of Charles I.’

Presented to us collectively these edifices have all the picturesqueness of a romance, interspersed as they are by the human touch of the effigy, the gravestone, and the epitaph, as for instance that on a slab in the burial-ground of the parish of Foulden—

‘HIER LYETH ANE HONORABIL MAN GEORG RAMSAY
IN FULDEN BASTEL WHO DEPARTIT 4 JAN 1592
AND OF HIS AGE 74.

Fyfe fostring peace me bred
From thence the Merce me cald
the Merce to Marsis havis led
to hyde his battelis bald
Weried with varis and sore opprest
Death gave to Mars the foyl
and nov I have more quyvet rest
than in my native soyl
Fyfe Merce Mars Mort these fatal fover
Al hail my dayes hes dreven ovr.’

Of the Report on the Monuments of the County of Sutherland it must suffice to say that—as was to be expected—they belong mainly to prehistoric times. ‘Many examples of well-known types have been noted for the first time,’ and ‘a large number of constructions, representing types of early habitations, which have not hitherto been made the subject of special observation in the mainland of Scotland, have been examined and planned.’ Nor is it surprising to find that many prehistoric constructions have been wholly or partially destroyed, for it is natural that farmers and road surveyors should take little heed of apparently ordinary-looking mounds and blocks of stone. We are inclined to think that when, as is now the case, a complete inventory has been compiled of the prehistoric monuments of a county such as that of Sutherland, a selection should be made of the most representative constructions, and that these should be permanently safeguarded by a public authority. The case of the remainder may be left to the public spirit of their owners, subject to the demands of agriculture or road communication.

Leaving the Scotch reports, for space will not permit of further discussion of them, we turn to the Inventory of Hertfordshire, which is at once a local history, an inventory of the monuments of the county, and a schedule of those selected by the Commission as most worthy of preservation. Some practical considerations arise on this report. It cannot be overlooked that the Commission has taken two years to investigate the condition of a single county; obviously, therefore, if the whole of England is to be inventoried in a reasonable time, the Commission must be strengthened, or its area of activity, by means of subordinates, must be enlarged. We are told in this report that the Commission is now engaged on the monuments of Buckinghamshire: it is time that work should also be begun on those of other counties. As has been said, the Commission publish a schedule of a number of monuments as especially worthy of preservation: there is a danger that the exclusion from it of many monuments may give rise to an impression that these are of no value, and that it matters not what may happen to them. There is a common agreement now among archaeologists and those interested in the history of our country that every ancient sculptured tomb and engraved brass should be carefully preserved. It would be well, therefore, that in future reports a general statement should be made that these, though not specially mentioned, should be well cared for. For example, there is at Little Munden an early fifteenth-century altar tomb with

effigies of a knight and a lady, which, with another of a similar character, but of earlier date, is carefully described in the inventory. Neither of these interesting monuments is however included in the list of those selected as especially worthy of preservation. In regard to this list archaeologists are certain to differ, so that it is the more necessary that it should be clearly regarded not as excluding the proper protection of monuments not mentioned in it. There is a good deal in fact to be said for an inventory only, with an option to those in authority to take steps to preserve any monument of sufficient value which is placed in it. Professor Baldwin Brown has pointed out that the distinction between classed and unclassed monuments

‘operates very favourably in the case of the scheduled object, upon which is set the official stamp of merit and importance, but the monuments that remain below the line, as it were, suffer proportionately in esteem. The difference between “classe” and “non-classe” is necessarily very great, whereas monuments shade off very gradually in artistic value and historical significance, and many judges of these things might place some of the unclassified monuments above others which are on the list. The fact indeed that a monument is excluded from the schedule may seem to the heedless an official hint that it is fair game for the spoiler. Hence the principle of “classement” is by no means universally approved by those most interested in the care of monuments, and the sixth international Congress for Art History held at Lubeck in 1900 decided that “the limitation of the protection of the state only to a few classified monuments cannot be entirely approved of either from the point of view of art or of that of history.”’*

The above statement shows that the inventory is after all the important document in these reports and must form the basis for the work of preservation.

As regards the county of Hertford, for the first time there is now in existence an authoritative list of the antiquities of an English shire. Its history may be read in these careful and unimpassioned details, though we miss in them the human element—for what is Mackery End without Lamb, and Hatfield without the Cecils—yet they bring up vividly the long history of this English county, dominated ecclesiastically by St. Albans, politically and socially by Hatfield. The county has its special characteristics—a homely charm, a mingling of park and wood and farm—always tinged and touched by the wealth and the

* The Care of Ancient Monuments, p. 57.

proximity of London, yet always retaining a peaceful and prosperous picturesqueness.

But for the moment we must leave Hertfordshire and consider some further practical points, for just as the three Commissions on Ancient Monuments were a necessary sequel to the legislation which preceded their appointment, so the enumeration, the official assertion of a national interest in certain remains—monuments and buildings—is a prelude to yet further legislation. Supervision of well-ascertained memorials of past ages is necessary, but at the same time the less interference either with private or semi-public rights, with domestic or with architectural buildings, there is, the better. But negligence or commercial motives * may from time to time endanger a national relic or memorial, and therefore some body should exist whose duty it is to supervise and take prompt steps, if necessary, to safeguard remains or works catalogued in the reports of the several Royal Commissions, and which are of such value as to be regarded as historical memorials which ought to be safeguarded. Such a duty can, in our opinion, best be performed through the agency

* The Welsh Commission have rightly drawn attention to the impending destruction of the great prehistoric camp on the summit of Penmaenmawr. This camp lies within the area of ground granted on a lease by the Crown for a period of fifty-two years from October 10, 1899, for the purpose of quarrying stone. 'There is, indeed, no possibility of working the quarry without destroying the camp, and the instance is one in which a work that has survived for centuries is being sacrificed to the utilitarian requirements of modern times. It is possible that a clause might have been introduced into the lease which would have prolonged the existence of the ancient fortress for a lengthened period, but as matters are, there is no hope of saving one of the finest examples of prehistoric fortification in the British Isles from ultimate annihilation. The Commissioners are glad to learn that, making the best of the circumstances, the Cambrian Archaeological Association has arranged for a complete survey and plans of the entire camp, so that at least there shall remain for posterity an adequate description of this famous ancient monument; and we understand that the lessees, who, apart from the necessities of their work, have expressed their readiness to co-operate in every way in the preparation of a plan of the camp, have also given instructions for the search after and preservation of any objects of antiquity that may be encountered in the course of their quarrying.' The irony of the situation is that the camp is being destroyed because the Crown did not exclude this important monument from the quarrying lease, in other words, lessen the extent of the quarrying operation.

of a committee of each County and Borough Council, which should contain some co-opted members learned or interested in archaeology and history. In these days in every county and town are to be found some well-qualified persons with technical knowledge, and if some of these placed their services at the disposal of the local authority, there could be little fear of any unforeseen danger operating unexpectedly to the detriment of these national memorials. A short amendment of the Act of 1900 would attain the end in view. Further, having regard to the admirable work performed by the National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty * it would seem desirable to enlarge the second section of the Act, and to give power to a County or Borough Council—for a Borough Council should be placed in the same position as a County Council—to contribute to the cost of preserving and maintaining a national monument vested in this society. By this means there might in some cases be a combination of official and voluntary action which would be effective, and, from a public point of view, economical. In a word, therefore, the present requirements are some enlargement of the powers of the English Commission; at any rate, so that these investigations may extend over the eighteenth century. Some increase of their staff is also desirable, so that the survey may be carried on more rapidly, and some amendments of existing legislation with a view to the future security of ascertained national monuments.

Professor Baldwin Brown touches somewhat shortly and tentatively on a subject which since his book was published has become of more practical importance, especially since the reports of the three Commissions—the subject of compulsory purchase. As soon as there comes into existence an official Inventory of Ancient Monuments, some of which are classed as worthy of preservation, it appears to follow that if one of the specially classed monuments or any other of sufficient importance of the non-classed monuments is in danger of destruction, there should be some machinery by which it should be compulsorily transferred to a public body. The very fact that an official inquiry has pronounced a particular structure to be an ancient monument implies a duty on the public to preserve it in safety. In some cases such a duty can only

* This Society is already the permanent guardian of several important historical monuments such as the Joiners' Hall, Salisbury, the Court House, Long Crendon, Bucks, and Barrington Court, Somerset, a fine example of domestic architecture of the Tudor period.

be carried out by means of a power to purchase this structure against the will of the owner. It may be admitted that such a power should only be exercised in extreme cases, and after other means have failed. Compulsory purchase again is one of those measures which cannot become law in regard to particular subjects unless there is a strong public feeling in favour of it. It is obvious that in Great Britain at least such a public force did not exist when the Ancient Monument Protection Act which is now in force became law. But it is equally certain—as shown by the appointment of these Commissions—that public opinion has of late years made important advances. And we are sure that public opinion would favour a judicious amendment of the present Acts, so as to permit of the introduction into them of a power of compulsory purchase. Fortunately, the same public opinion which would support such an alteration has an influence on those who happen to be owners of ancient monuments, so that their safety is increased by it. Yet there is no saying when some erection of national or local interest may not be in peril, and when the mere fact of a power of compulsory purchase existing in the statute book would not either directly or indirectly be the means of preserving it from decay or destruction.

It is clear—if only from a perusal of the inventory prepared by the English Royal Commission in their report on Hertfordshire—that many practical difficulties may arise in regard to the preservation of historical monuments, more especially of secular buildings. Few domestic buildings have remained untouched. We may take as an example the description of a house which occurs under the first parish noted in the inventory, Abbots Langley.

‘The Lawn, a house, now two cottages, in the hamlet of Hunton Bridge, about one and a quarter miles south-west of the parish church, is said to have been a hunting lodge of Charles I., and was probably built c. 1642, a date which appears over one of the fire-places. It is a rectangular building of two storeys and an attic, facing north. It was lengthened towards the east in the 19th century, and all the walls are faced with modern brick; the roof is tiled. The central chimney stack and another at the back are built of thin, 17th century bricks. The parlour of the easternmost cottage contains a wide fireplace, now filled in; over it is an elaborate decoration in plaster, consisting of the Royal arms, with the initials C. R. above and the date, 1642, below them, and on each side a large fleur-de-lis; the design was originally enclosed by a band of ornament, but only part of it remains. The ceiling, a fine example of plaster work, is divided by two large moulded beams and sub-

divided into smaller panels, each containing the Royal arms, or a unicorn, a crowned Tudor rose or a fleur-de-lis; two of the panels and part of a third have been destroyed by the erection of a staircase. The rooms in the upper storey of both cottages have old oak floors. Condition—Good; much altered.'

The Commission places Abbots Langley Church in the Schedule of Monuments which it regards as especially worthy of preservation, but the house which is above described and several other domestic buildings quite naturally are not included. But if this house could be preserved, there would also be preserved several interesting architectural and historical details. Yet these details are so largely intermingled with comparatively modern work that it would be impossible to expect a local authority to spend public money on it, or that it should be kept for public inspection. To a considerable extent, therefore, private owners must be relied on to preserve details of historical or artistic interest, and public preservation, whether by local authorities or subsidised societies, must be confined, if we take buildings, to such, for example, as the Court House at Long Crendon, Bucks, or Milton's Cottage at Chalfont St. Giles in the same county, which are important in their entirety. Differences will naturally arise in regard to buildings which are rather on the line, but these can only be settled by the good sense of responsible guardians. Change is an inevitable feature in every community, and a vanishing England—or, more accurately, a changing England—cannot be prevented: with change must come destruction, and many old and interesting features of the country must disappear or be preserved only in ruins. It is too often overlooked that features which we now regard as ancient and important themselves replaced earlier and perhaps not less interesting or picturesque landmarks, and that the antiquaries of the past lamented the disappearance of interesting remains just as do the antiquaries of to-day—'Many fair monuments therein,' wrote Stow of St. Botolph's Church, 'are now defaced and gone.' Therefore whilst we preach preservation we should also inculcate the principles of artistic workmanship, in order that beauty shall characterise what may become hereafter monuments to future generations of the people of the present age. In past time, for example, a high narrow bridge was sufficient for wayfarers on foot, for packhorses and small vehicles. When coaches began to ply, bridges had often to be enlarged. Maidenhead in Berkshire had an ancient and well-remembered bridge, which in 1772 was replaced by the larger but well-proportioned and dignified structure which still spans the Thames.

In our day many bridges which sufficed for the traffic of the eighteenth century will not suit modern demands. Traffic must be provided for, but in so doing local authorities should endeavour to erect structures which have alike the beauty and the permanence of those which were built by our forefathers of old.

Both Mr. Ditchfield in his interesting but discursive volume on the antiquities of England, to which he has given the catchy title of 'Vanishing England,' and the authors of the first report of the Welsh Commission dwell on the educational aspect of the subject. The importance of a knowledge of local antiquities as illustrative of the past life of the nation is becoming more recognised every day. But this educational aspect may be regarded from another point of view, namely, its tendency to help in the preservation of memorials of the past, whether by public authorities, as in the case of the Eleanor Cross at Waltham, which is now under the care of the Hertfordshire County Council, or by private owners. Not a little assistance may be obtained from this influence, and it is in the eyes of many the merit not only of books such as Mr. Ditchfield's 'Vanishing England,' but others of a similar and in some cases more scientific character, such as Mr. Bond's excellent volumes on 'Screens' and on 'Fonts,' and Mr. Macklin's work on 'The Monumental Brasses of England,'* that they cause a popular recognition of the value and interest of national antiquities, and consequently result in their preservation. It is on this influence that local antiquarian societies must depend for a useful existence, for the enthusiasm of a few students cannot create a really flourishing society or enable it, if established, to obtain, if the necessity arises, funds for the preservation of a memorial of the past. The importance of such local societies—and one should be found in every county—cannot be overrated, for such a body may be the means of safeguarding in perpetuity monuments of local importance, which may not on the other hand have a sufficiently large national interest to cause them to be placed under the care of the central local government or a central society—and we must never forget that monuments of what we have called local interest, in the aggregate have national importance, and even individually may throw light on some small detail which helps to elucidate a phase of bygone society.

In this matter of the protection by public authorities of ancient monuments, Great Britain has been behind other

* See *Edinburgh Review*, July 1907.

European nations. In Belgium a royal decree of 1824 urged those in possession of churches to undertake the preservation of ancient buildings, and forbade the demolition of any ecclesiastical building. In 1835 another step was taken, and

‘in view of the importance of assuring the preservation of all national monuments remarkable for their antiquity, their association, or their artistic value, another decree was issued constituting a Royal Commission for the purpose of advising as to the repairs required by such monuments. Nearly 200,000 francs are annually voted for expenditure for these purposes. The strict application of these precautionary measures has allowed a number of monuments of the highest interest in their relation to art and archaeology to be protected and defended, but it does not appear that the Government controls in any way those monuments which are in the hands of private persons.’*

In France certain national monuments of historic or artistic interest are placed under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Instruction, whilst in Germany and Holland the system of state preservation has long been in existence. It could scarcely be otherwise, since monuments of the past are as much history as is the written page, and the observation of them is but one form of historical study.†

Having sketched the present position of the subject of the preservation of ancient monuments, and indicated some possible and feasible developments of the movement, it is unnecessary to refer further to the monuments of Hertfordshire from this point of view. It is preferable to note the value of the survey of this county as an indication of the importance of the county as an area exemplifying the growth of national life in a particular part of England, and how it identifies some famous persons with a particular locality. Yet one must not forget to give due credit to work that has been done by antiquaries and chroniclers in the past under unfavourable and difficult conditions. Thus ‘The History and Antiquities of the County of Hertford,’ by Robert Clutterbuck, published in 1801, is a splendid instance of long and patient research, and forms a written and pictorial representation of the county at the end of the eighteenth century of the highest antiquarian and social value, whilst as a local history it must ever remain an unfailing storehouse of information.

* *Vanishing England*, p. 393.

† Full details of the laws of the several European countries will be found in Professor Baldwin Brown’s valuable work ‘*The Care of Ancient Monuments.*’

The history of Hertfordshire begins with the Romano-British period, for in the previous obscure and prehistoric ages there is no local characterisation. The link between Hertfordshire in the first century after Christ and later times is St. Albans, with the remains of the Romano-British town of Verulam, extending over a large area. Thereafter the various details of the abbey church carry the story of Hertfordshire through many generations of Englishmen. Destroyed in A.D. 62 by the Iceni under Boadicea, Verulam rose later again into importance, and 'its buildings, though as yet imperfectly 'known to us, indicate some wealth and splendour and cover 'an area nearly two miles in circumference.' Again demolished by the English, who built their houses outside the Roman walls and higher up the hill, the place became famous by reason of the foundation by King Offa II. in the eighth century of the Abbey of St. Albans, near by which rose a Saxon church, of which some remains are still visible in the north and south transepts of the existing abbey church. From that time this building exemplifies the ecclesiastical architecture of every age, and its history, down even to its somewhat drastic renovation by a wealthy nobleman in our days, tells of the course of local feeling of many generations in regard to ecclesiastical buildings, whilst its monuments and brasses, especially among these the admirable fourteenth-century Flemish masterpiece which forms the memorial of Abbot de la Mare, give the personal note to the building which is so important an addition to the history of a church. Systematic excavation, as the English Report states, would enlarge our whole knowledge of the history of the Romano-British city. It is to be regretted that this work is not, for the present at least, likely to be undertaken, since it has been stated that negotiations for this purpose between the Society of Antiquaries and the owner of the land have fallen through. If the features of the ground plan of the city could be disclosed, there would be before us in some physical detail, even if somewhat imperfectly, the city as it once existed, so that in a comparatively small area there would stand together the Roman city,* the medieval abbey church, and the modern

* The importance of the Roman remains of Verulam is such that it may be desirable to give the following extract from the Historical Introduction to the English Report (p. 3). 'Among these 'buildings may be mentioned the forum, lately excavated in part, 'which seems to have been like similar buildings elsewhere. This 'forum may have been laid out before A.D. 62, when the place

town—a town, be it remembered, which in itself is of no little interest for its portrayal in a modest fashion of the secular architecture of many centuries.

The ecclesiastical pre-eminence of St. Albans is apt to dwarf the importance of the other churches of Hertfordshire, which, coupled with the secular buildings still existing and with the position of the villages and the numerous small market towns, give us a more lifelike presentation of this portion of England in the past than is realised by the consideration of any one of these buildings as a single memorial. Hertfordshire, in spite of its woodland character—for in the west the beech woods which covered the Chiltern Hills extended within it, whilst the heavier Middlesex forests gave it also a forestal character in the middle, south, and east—has always been abundantly populated. But in its more southern parts the proximity of London 'has affected the natural character' of this portion. It has given to it something of an urbane rurality, and it has touched it with that air of civilised ease which characterises the outskirts of Paris and of Florence. As we cast our glance over it to-day from the hilly downs in the north to the environs of London in the south, we see a county which in its general features has remained almost unchanged for generations—small towns quiet but prosperous, villages grouped around a green, a church in the centre or at one end, sometimes at a little distance, adjoining a hall, built originally in this case on the demesne land of the lord, abundant

'received municipal rank. From the evidence discovered during its excavation, it was manifestly destroyed by fire at some time, but whether this conflagration occurred in 62, or later, is not known. Certainly it was afterwards repaired (though somewhat roughly) and partially rebuilt. The Roman theatre, the foundations of which have been found to the west of the building last referred to, is notable as the only Roman theatre which has yet been discovered in Britain. There are also extensive and substantial remains of town walls whose precise age is uncertain. The town can hardly have been walled when the Iceni took it in A.D. 62. It has been pointed out that in the western provinces of the Roman Empire town walls began generally to be erected or re-erected after about A.D. 250, when barbarian invasions were becoming frequent. The walls of Verulam may well have been erected late in the history of the Empire. They were manned, probably, not by Roman soldiers, but by the citizens of the town. In any case, these walls are among the most noted relics of the Roman age surviving in the south-east of England. They deserve and demand adequate preservation and attention. These remains are, of course, only fragments of former splendour.'

woodland and gorse-covered commons, and many fine country houses, surrounded oftentimes with large parks, which have been not seldom the homes, in the past, as in recent years, of statesmen and of those who have stood high in all forms of business in the Metropolis.

The small towns of Hertfordshire are indeed amongst the most characteristic and agreeable features of the county. They extend from Tring on a spur of the Chiltern Hills in the west to Sawbridgeworth in the east among low-lying meadows, and include, almost in a line equidistant between the wilder parts in the north and the suburban districts in the south, the towns of Hemel Hempstead, St. Albans, Harpenden, Hatfield, and Hertford. Others might be enumerated, and in each instance, though some modern changes may be observed, each in itself or in its immediate surroundings is very typical of past times, and each contains memorials—often, it is true, quite unassuming—of bygone social conditions. Each of these little towns has one or more churches, which, though more or less restored, present many ancient features, often of great value. Thus the church of St. Mary at Hemel Hempstead is ‘a valuable example of a crucifix parish church of the twelfth century,’ whilst more than one secular building in the same town has substantial remains of domestic edifices of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, sufficient to give character to the place and to recall the centuries that are past. It is, however, not so much the view of a single one of the small Hertfordshire towns that gives individuality to the county as their numbers, the general features common to each, and the place they take in a survey of the county. Their harmony is not broken by any large manufacturing centre, and the peaceful tenor of their existence seems still to continue as in the days of old.

Just as St. Albans dominates the ecclesiastical edifices of Hertfordshire, so Hatfield—in spite of the charm and attraction of such buildings, for instance, as Salisbury Hall near Shenley, Rothamsted near Harpenden, and Queen Hoo near Tewin, excellent examples of the architecture of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—stands pre-eminent among the secular buildings now, as when Evelyn wrote that it was ‘inferior to few in England for its architecture.’ Like St. Albans, too, though to a lesser extent, it carries us across many generations. We see it a palace of the Bishops of Ely until Henry VIII. turned it into a royal residence. That monarch and his successors in various degrees are closely associated with it, until in 1607 James I. exchanged it for Theobalds on the eastern side of

the county with Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury. It is somewhat difficult to understand, as the late Mr. Brewer writes in his admirable essay * on this house and its treasures, how the first house with a slight exception came to fall into a state of decay so as to cause the erection by the Earl of Salisbury of the present building—one constructed after his own plans by his own workmen. And when we reach this point we are struck by the notable coincidence that whilst its founder was the adviser of one queen, so the statesman who in modern times is so closely associated with it was the counsellor of another. Hatfield indeed presents a remarkable example of the lessons of local history, because we cannot even see it without at once being brought into touch with a number of historical characters. To know Hatfield is to know them, and whilst their lives are thus illuminated they give character and idiosyncrasy to the shire. Unlike men who have come from Northern or Midland localities, the statesmen who are connected with Hertfordshire for the most part serve to link it with London, emphasising in this that particular characteristic which we have termed its urbane rurality.

With Gorhambury and St. Albans the memory of Bacon is associated as closely as that of Robert Cecil with Hatfield. It is remarkable how many places in England bring us into personal touch with famous men in some part of their career. Chalfont St. Giles, for example, in the neighbouring county of Buckingham, reveals to us one phase of the later life of Milton, as the riverside village of Horton does that of his opening manhood. But it is rare that from infancy almost to death a life so full, so active, and so important as that of Bacon is connected with one locality. Yet Gorhambury, the country house of his father Sir Nicholas, who is so completely in one's memory overshadowed by his illustrious son, was the place where he passed many of his earliest years: here, as a prosperous and patriotic manhood raised him to public honour and to some measure of wealth, he lived to put into practical form his ideas on gardens and pleasure grounds.† Here he built another house—Verulam House—hard by Gorhambury, some remnants of which are still visible, and it was to Gorhambury he went when in the spring of 1621 affairs were darkening around him and his ruin was impending, so that with his meditative intellect he could undisturbedly survey his position. And it was here that he wrote the prayer

* Hatfield—in 'English Essays,' London, 1881.

† The estate of Gorhambury came to Francis Bacon on the death of his elder brother Anthony in 1601.

and psalm which form so singular a revelation of a unique mind and character—‘and now when I thought most of peace ‘and honour thy hand is heavy upon me.’ It was to Gorham-bury too that in the summer of the same year Bacon retired after his condemnation by the House of Lords and subsequent release from the Tower. It is not difficult to picture him among his gardens and in his pleasant woodlands in the long June evenings looking back over his eventful career, and, ever sanguine, planning the future with unfailing hope. We watch that future grow more gloomy, until the philosopher and statesman, pinched for money and still in disgrace, finally retires to the modest chambers at Gray’s Inn where he had launched his bark and where he was unhappily to die. But he came back to Hertfordshire to be laid at rest in the church of St. Michael, where a life-sized and reposeful statue still commemorates him and recalls a life which is so closely connected with Hertfordshire, and which, whether in the ancient church or in the walks of Gorhambury, can never be contemplated without admiration and emotion.

It is fitting perhaps that whilst Hatfield remains in all its early glory to remind us how its builder died honoured and powerful, there have been left of Gorhambury House but the walls and porch of the hall and a little of the main courtyard,*

* The following is the statement in the Inventory of the Royal Commission, pp. 192-3: ‘The porch is of stone and the other walls of brick and flint. The house was built by Sir Nicholas Bacon between 1563 and 1568, and a complete plan exists in a manuscript history of Gorhambury by the Hon. Charlotte Grimston, 1821. The porch is a good example of Renaissance work, and is of two storeys, with a parapet; the lower storey is open on three sides, and has semi-circular arches now under-built with modern brickwork. The upper storey has square-headed windows; the front window, which has lost its mullions, is flanked by semi-circular niches with a mutilated figure in one of them. On the parapet are carved the royal arms, France modern, quartering the leopards of England. The parapet is finished with small pediments, and at one angle is the fragment of a statue. The windows in the other walls are square-headed, with stone mullions and transoms; the uncusped heads of the lights are four-centred. At the west end is part of an octagonal clock-tower, and there is also an open fireplace with a tiled back of herring-bone pattern. Further west is a small fragment of wall containing a semi-circular niche in which is a statue of Henry VIII. in armour, with the head and one leg missing. There are many fragments of moulded stone-work lying near the ruins. Condition: Bad; the stonework of the porch is cracked and decayed; it is under-built and is kept up by a large brick

memorials of profound interest yet suggestive of a ruined and broken career.

The remarkable relations between Hertfordshire and the statesmen of the seventeenth and of the early years of the eighteenth centuries was continued by Lord Somers, who was in his later years intimately connected with the county, for in 1701 he bought a house and estate—Brookmans, near North Mimms—where he chiefly resided after his impeachment for his share in the Partition Treaty. At this ‘fair house,’ which was unfortunately destroyed by fire in recent years, Somers died in 1716. The personal atmosphere which surrounds both Hatfield and Gorhambury is wanting in connexion with Somers’ life in Hertfordshire, which still further emphasises the attractions which the country around London had for statesmen in every age, as well as some special attributes of a delightful part of England.

Belonging in historical interest to the period of those men to whose connexion with Hertfordshire we have alluded is the Rye House. It will surprise many—even of those whose pleasure in the study of historical antiquities is considerable, to know that the house still remains in good condition.

‘The remains consist of a large sixteenth-century gate-house, and a long, low wooden building, possibly of the seventeenth century. These buildings were the scene of the “Rye House Plot” in 1683, and are now open to the public. The two-storeyed gate-house, facing east, is built of red brick, covered with a diaper pattern of blue bricks; the roof is flat, and the embattled parapet has cross-shaped piercings in the merlons. The stone doorway is in the centre, and has a pointed arch in a square head; on each side of it is a small brick-moulded window under a square hood-mould. Over the windows are slightly projecting bays, carried on a corbel-table, which is repeated over the doorway at a higher level. In the bays are mullioned oriel windows, one of two lights, the other of three, which light the first floor; they are finished with embattled parapets, at the level of the main parapet string-course. At the back is a brick chimney stack, with a fine twisted shaft. The entrance passage is flanked by small rooms; on the first floor is a single large room, which has a fireplace of clunch, with moulded jambs and a flat four-centred arch; the overmantel and the carved frieze under the ceiling are of late seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century date; in the fireplace is a pair of old dog-irons; the room also contains two seventeenth-century chests, and a writing-desk,

‘buttress, iron ties and bands. The other walls are ruinous; ‘some of them are loaded with ivy, and trees and shrubs are growing ‘among them.’ The note of the condition is a grave reflection on the public spirit of the present owner of these historical remains.

dated 1670. A circular staircase, opening into the south-west corner of this room, leads up to the flat roof and down to a pseudo-dungeon. The wooden building on the north of the gate-house contains a considerable quantity of panelling of various designs and dates, much of it probably collected from elsewhere; some is of sixteenth-century linen pattern, and the rest appears to be of the seventeenth century; a large fireplace has seventeenth-century woodwork round it. On one of the panels are the arms: a chevron between three lions' heads erased, impaling a chief with three stags' heads cabossed thereon.*

Here, too, is preserved a remarkable piece of furniture, the Great Bed of Ware, which was mentioned by Shakespeare in 'Twelfth Night,' and which, though it has painted on it the date 1463, is of late sixteenth-century construction. Strangely enough, neither the house nor this piece of furniture is regarded by the Commission as specially worthy of preservation.

Panshanger, not far from Hatfield, continues the memory of the statesmen of the age of Bacon, Cecil, and Somers, for it was the place which Lord Chancellor Cowper fixed upon as a country home and where he died in 1723. It interests us, too, because it illustrates the manner in which noblemen of the eighteenth century collected works of art on their travels in Europe. The third Earl did more, it is true, than make the Grand Tour, for he lived many years at Florence, and in the fine apartments at Brocket are still to be seen the pictures which he spent his time in collecting.

We have already noted how Hatfield by its continuance as the house of the family of Cecil unites two epochs, and recalls to memory statesmen of the Elizabethan and Victorian ages. At no great distance from it we find a place with many natural charms, Brocket, which brings us into touch with two statesmen of a later epoch—Melbourne and Palmerston. Beneath a rather worldly and careless exterior, each hid very sterling qualities, and Melbourne has a permanent place in history as the judicious adviser of his youthful Queen. In Hertfordshire each found repose from the cares of office and of Parliament, but while Palmerston had no original connexion, and only became associated with it by reason that after the death of Lord Melbourne it became the property of his wife, Melbourne was the third of his generation who was the owner of Brocket, which was purchased by his grandfather, Mathew Lamb, in 1746, and was enlarged by his prosperous father, the first Viscount. The mere mention of Brocket brings us in touch with a political circle which includes many of the leading figures in public life during a long period of the reign of Queen

* Inventory of the Historical Monuments of Hertfordshire, p. 210.

Victoria. Short country visits week by week were not so common then as nowadays, but Brocket was the scene of numerous political meetings, and formed the resting-place of many eminent men. It filled in its day something of the position which Beaconsfield and Bulstrode in the adjoining county of Buckingham occupied in the eighteenth century, when Burke and Portland, each in his own dissimilar manner, held high positions in his party, and in the councils of the King.

Not far off is Knebworth, where its gifted owner, the first Baron Lytton, the successor of a line of Hertfordshire worthies of whom interesting monuments are to be seen in the village church,* collected political and literary friends; for in spite of some success as a politician, Bulwer Lytton was rather a man of letters than a statesman. But in its connexion with letters Hertfordshire calls for no special mention; to have been for thirty-five years the home of Young, more preferment-hunting divine than poet, will not cause the pleasant little town of Welwyn to become the object of a pilgrimage, though lovers of trees will note with pleasure and interest the avenue of limes which he planted soon after he was appointed to this preferment in 1730. Few things in country life are more interesting than investigations into the ages of trees, and in this avenue we have a grove of whose beginning there is no doubt. Evidently in 1781, when Johnson and Boswell visited Welwyn, the trees were of considerable size, for Boswell calls it, oddly enough, 'a fine Gothic arch,' and Johnson himself admired it. Some readers will perhaps find in this visit to Welwyn its chief attraction, for the imagination can take pleasure in portraying for itself this little expedition into Hertfordshire—Johnson seated at his tea in the unassuming inn, whilst Boswell, characteristically enough, was calling on the son of Dr. Young. Mackery End and Lamb are indissolubly united in English literature, but it is at once a sign of the slight literary interest of Hertfordshire and a tribute to the phrasing and feeling of Lamb that this Essay and that on Blakesmoor in Hertfordshire, with a few allusions to the county in his letters, almost entirely have given him in popular estimation a connexion with the county which is permanent. Nor is it surprising, for to those who love the country, his touches and his feeling for the charms of this southern shire are so full of insight and sympathy that they seem to embody impalpably the atmosphere and the attributes of a pleasant land.

* Of these the most important is the tomb of Sir William Lytton, 1704-5, a recumbent figure of marble under an elaborate canopy with arms and quarterings of Lytton.

ART. VI.—DESCRIPTIVE SOCIOLOGY.

1. *Descriptive Sociology*. Classified and arranged by HERBERT SPENCER. No. IX. *Chinese*. By E. T. C. WERNER. Edited by Henry R. Tedder. London: Williams and Norgate. 1910.
2. *Descriptive Sociology*. Classified and arranged by HERBERT SPENCER. No. X. *Greeks: Hellenic Era*. By J. P. MAHAFFY and W. A. GOLIGHER. Edited by Henry R. Tedder. London: Williams and Norgate. 1910.

AMONG persons who are occasionally taken by their avocations into such strongholds of culture as the London Library or the Athenæum Club there have probably been not a few during the last month or two whose attention has been arrested by the sight of two large, sombre-looking folio volumes bound with a severe simplicity suggestive of the aesthetic taste of the Mid-Victorian era. On approaching these ponderous tomes the cover is found to bear the somewhat alarming title of 'Descriptive Sociology'; and when, on looking a little farther down, the name of Herbert Spencer suddenly meets the eye the average reader probably concludes that these works are not for such as him, and hurries on to a more congenial atmosphere. If, however, curiosity should tempt him to linger for a moment and turn the pages of one of these works, he will speedily become aware that there lies before him a publication of very remarkable and unusual features. 'Hats off, gentlemen! A genius!' is the expression that will probably portray most accurately his mental condition. For the volumes are at once perceived to be monuments of prodigious industry, and to have gathered together between their dingy covers mountains of concentrated information on the institutions and habits of the peoples with which they deal that must inevitably be of unique value to every student interested in tracing the progress of civilisation.

Our passer-by, now thoroughly aroused, is soon struck by another fact. It is clear at a glance that no wide sale of these books is possible among a public which gloats over the lucubrations of Miss Marie Corelli and Mr. Hall Caine. It is clear also that their cost of production must have been very large. And it follows that the persons standing behind the work have not only had to find the brains and industry necessary for its compilation, but have had also to find a very considerable sum in cash to be laid out for the public advantage, with very

small probability of a return. And the reader, as he continues turning over the pages, remembers that he has seen no reviews in the newspapers, and wonders how the advertisements can have escaped his notice. But in truth it is not wonderful. For, while American syndicates dogging his footsteps have been industriously and unceasingly flaunting their shoddy wares in his face, these weighty books have crept unostentatiously into the world, almost as though they wished to escape notice: a wish which, while we cannot but admire it for its modesty, we regret we find ourselves unable to respect. Let us proceed to relate the circumstances and past history of the *Descriptive Sociology*.

In Herbert Spencer's '*System of Philosophy*,' commenced in 1860, the fourth great division was to deal with the '*Principles of Sociology*.' The foundation of this work must necessarily be laid in a vast accumulation of facts bearing on every department of social life. The acquisition of these facts must involve a vast amount of preliminary reading and study—more than Spencer himself could possibly find time to give it. He therefore determined to do the necessary reading by proxy, and in 1867, while still engaged on the enlarged edition of the '*Principles of Psychology*,' he appointed Dr. David Duncan, afterwards his biographer, to gather together and classify the facts ready for generalisation. Until his appointment as Professor of Logic at Madras in 1869, Dr. Duncan continued this work; and then it was not till after the lapse of many months that a suitable successor to him was found in Mr. James Collier. Later on the work was accelerated by the appointment of Dr. Richard Scheppegg, who undertook the collection of data on extinct and decayed civilised races. After the work had been some time in progress, Spencer concluded that it was too valuable to be confined to his own private use, and he determined to publish it. The first number accordingly was issued in July 1873, having cost approximately 650*l*. Before two years were over, Spencer wrote to his American friend, Youmans, that the undertaking had already cost him 2170*l*. against proceeds not yet received, but expected to amount to 400*l*. In 1878 the expenses had amounted to 3200*l*., of which only one quarter had been recovered from the sales. Finally, in 1881 the work was brought to an end, the losses on its publication being reckoned by Spencer to have reached 'considerably more than 4000*l*.,' if loss of interest, etc., on the money expended be included, and to have absorbed all the surplus proceeds of his literary work during fourteen years. By this time it had reached eight volumes, and was of immense service to Spencer as a

huge repository of facts from which to draw his conclusions in the 'Principles of Sociology.' But although necessity compelled him to desist on the publication of these eight volumes, he had determined that the undertaking should some day be resumed. Accordingly, in his will he left the bulk of his property in trust for the execution of this purpose, Mr. Henry Tedder being appointed general editor. After Spencer's death in 1903, therefore, the great work got under way again : and the first products of this revived activity now lie before us in the two volumes already noticed, following their immediate predecessors in the series by very nearly thirty years. Three further instalments are shortly due, the intention being to bring the total number up to about twenty-four.

The two volumes now produced are in every way worthy of their forerunners. It might have been feared that the absence of Spencer's vigilant supervision would have resulted in careless or indolent work. Nothing of the sort is observable. On the contrary, we venture to express the opinion that one of them in particular—that on the Chinese—is very conspicuously superior to any of the volumes published in Spencer's lifetime. The compiler of this volume, Mr. E. T. C. Werner, the British Consul at Foochow, is warmly to be congratulated on the production of a work which, in its monumental industry, in its thoroughness of detail, in the incredible quantity of facts which it contains, is paralleled by no other work that we remember ever to have seen. In his Preface to the work Mr. Tedder points out that

'the extracts from the Chinese books, which number nearly 800, were specially selected and translated by Mr. Werner, while the extracts from Western literatures are taken from 238 books, ranging from Marco Polo to authors of our own day. The total number of quotations and abridged extracts, which are encyclopaedic in range of information and systematic in the method of their presentation, extends to upwards of 10,000.'

The work was in progress long before Spencer's death. The reports of its gradual advance were, we are told,* among the most cheering news that came to Spencer during his declining years. Had he been able to see the result, we cannot doubt that it would have caused him profound satisfaction. The immense cost of its production, said to be near 1400*l.* and requiring the book to be highly priced, is far more than justified by the extraordinary value of the classified facts which Mr. Werner has so lucidly brought together.

* Duncan's 'Life of Spencer.'

Drs. Mahaffy and Goligher had likewise performed their heavy task in a manner worthy of the traditions of the Descriptive Sociology ; and Mr. Tedder, the editor, deserves to be complimented not only on the successful production of these two volumes, but also on the announcements of the future volumes which he has allotted to authors whose names are a sure guarantee of success. We hope, however, that the trustees will not lose sight of the further provision in Spencer's will, under which they are required to issue in octavo form the extracts on which the tables are founded. Doubtless the compilation of new sections is a more important task for the present ; but there are many who will look forward to the ultimate completion of the work in the two editions foreshadowed by Spencer. We have little further to say by way of comment on the two volumes now under review. The outstanding fact is the lasting credit which must ever attach to Mr. Werner's name for his share in the work. We shall pass henceforth to a more general discussion of the theories and principles grounded by Spencer and others upon the Descriptive Sociology as a whole, paying special attention to the two new instalments of it.

For we must hasten to note that a recognition of the value of the Descriptive Sociology by no manner of means implies adhesion to Spencer's sociological theories. The Descriptive Sociology contains no theories, but merely piles of facts on which theories may be rested. The validity of the theories will then depend not only on the accuracy of the facts, which is all that is vouched for by the Descriptive Sociology, but on the accuracy of the reasoning by which the theory is induced from the facts. The method employed in the Descriptive Sociology has been to read all the available books of authority written by travellers about the nation which is being studied. Every passage in these books that is of any value as a sociological fact is extracted ; and the vast number of extracts thus accumulated are classified according to the particular institution or custom to which they refer. Finally, the substance of them is epitomised and arranged in columns in tabular form in such a manner that by reading from left to right one can observe the co-existences between various institutions at the same time ; and, by reading from top to bottom, one can observe the sequences in any institution at different times. The classification was made by Herbert Spencer himself, and is so conceived as to exhibit in the simplest manner the structural and functional characteristics of the society : division of labour, regulation of labour, domestic institutions (marital

and filial), laws, general and local government, military, ecclesiastical and professional institutions, mutilations, funeral rites, laws of intercourse, habits and customs, aesthetic, moral and religious ideas, the state of knowledge, the language, distribution, exchange, production, arts, landworks, habitations, food, clothing, implements, weapons, aesthetic products, etc.

The most formidable obstacle in the way of arriving at the truth regarding the origin of the various social institutions is the difficulty of taking the primitive man's point of view. To divest ourselves of the whole of our education, to exclude from our minds any idea or any word of the smallest generality, to think wholly in the concrete, to banish reflection and to allow every passing emotion to translate itself straightway into action with the wanton impulsiveness of the savage—these are the mental transformations which we have to perform before we can arrive at the outlook upon life which alone is possible to primitive man. We have to throw ourselves into such a mental attitude that primitive ideas and beliefs no longer appear to us astonishing, or wicked, or amusing, but natural and obvious, and such as would naturally be entertained by a mind shorn of all the trappings and artificiality given by modern civilisation, modern knowledge, and modern morality. This is the method that has been widely used by sociologists in their endeavour to interpret primitive customs and beliefs. Is it a practicable method? Is the immense transformation implied a possible one for civilised men to adopt, and are the conclusions which are obtained thereby endowed with any degree of certainty? We believe the transformation is not possible, and that except for testing conclusions otherwise reached the method is of little practical value.

To interpret the characters of others by one's own character is the method that everyone uses more or less for the purpose of appraising the motives and feelings of others in every day social life. In youth the invariable assumption (not made consciously, of course) is that everyone is exactly alike, that the same motives will affect the same people in the same way. In babies the tendency is altogether overpowering. A baby will cover its eyes with its hands, and then think that no one can see it. The state of the whole universe is judged by the state in which the baby's mind happens for the moment to be. It is only with advancing experience of life that the more observant among us begin to discover that others are actuated in quite different ways from ourselves, that they are affected by motives to which we are strangers, and that they are unaffected by other motives which habitually guide our conduct. If

we are naturally of a reflective disposition, and disinclined to active effort, we find that there are others to whom active effort comes easily and to whom reflection is hard. We begin to abandon our earlier assumptions that all men are equally sensitive to pain, equally prone to the same pleasures, equally capable of anger, of tenderness, etc., that decision, accuracy, energy, are equally possible to all. We get rid of the ridiculous notion that all differences between mankind are due to differences in the exertion of 'the will,' and that it is only a perverse refusal to apply their will-power that separates the worst from the best of mankind. This mental attitude, universal among children, common even among adults, is the source of all error in reading aright the motives of mankind. Political opinions offer an example. Many people are utterly bewildered to understand how it is that others differ from them, and are finally driven to account for it by supposing hypocrisy, and that the true views are concealed for some evil motive, kept below the surface.

We must, then, fully recognise the immense liability to error in which we are involved when we attempt to understand other people by placing ourselves in their position. This may be called the subjective method. But what other method is open to the sociologist? Only the objective method, which every other science pursues. We must look upon our primitive man as a puppet worked by the laws of physiology and psychology. We must reckon up the external forces that fall upon him, and from our acquaintance with these laws must work out how they will take effect upon the puppet, and what beliefs and actions will issue therefrom.

Herbert Spencer not infrequently insisted, as an element in method, on the necessity of proceeding always from the known to the unknown. It may therefore be well to illustrate the manner in which psychological forces operate by reference first to the civilisations that we know at first hand, and afterwards to carry back the method to civilisations that we only read of. What mental forces are the most predominant in guiding the conduct of men? Not intellect certainly: intellectual operations have no driving force; their very nature is passive and inert. Not will either; that only concerns the outward reaction upon the environment of the character already fixed. There remain only the emotions and feelings which dominate and constitute the whole character of man. It is a well-established law of sociology that the society and social institutions are tolerably accurate indexes to the characters of the men who compose them.

Under the proposition just broached, therefore, we should expect to find social institutions representing the *feelings* of the people. Let us glance at one or two to see how they fulfil our expectations.

In the first instance, consider political institutions. Of these there exist innumerable varieties. The Government may be monarchical or republican; it may be aristocratic or democratic; it may be severe or mild; its sphere may be widely extended or sharply delimited. But in all these cases the ruling power is but an outward sign and a product of the habitual sentiments of the masses of the people. The irresponsible autocracy of the Czar is just as harmonious to the sentiments of the Russian people as the circumscribed authority of the President is to the sentiments of the American people. The average Russian has a mind which takes pleasure in subordination and in its correlative of absolute power. It appeals to his sentiments, which are wholly different from ours; and were some external or internal force to set up a mode of government altogether dissimilar in appearance, it would soon be found in its operation on the proletariat to differ very little from its predecessor. The changes in the French Government during last century were, indeed, immense to the naked eye, but had little effect upon the lives and activities of the citizens. With the freest institutions a people may be enslaved under harsh laws and heavy taxation. Under the most tyrannical institutions they may enjoy political prosperity, a universally accessible system of justice, and freedom from corruption. The only changes that do fundamentally, and not only in appearance, modify political institutions are changes in the feelings of the people. It is a general change in Russian feeling that has produced rebellion against bureaucracy. The change however has not yet gone far enough to do more than effect slight modifications. It is a general change in British feeling that has led to the steady demand for enlarging the franchise and which has been embodied in successive Reform Bills. And it is because political institutions rest upon feelings that the effects of these Reform Bills have always been much smaller than were anticipated both by their advocates and by their opponents. If the character of Government were a function of electoral systems, then the admission of some millions of new electors from a previously excluded class must of necessity have a profound effect. If, on the other hand, Government at all times is a reflection of the minds of the whole people, then the enfranchisement of new classes need not be expected to make very great differences. Probably the immediate effect of the Reform Bills

has been less even than it appears to have been. For the very fact of Reform Bills denotes a changing sentiment among the people, and this changing sentiment will certainly be expressed in a great variety of ways at the same time. The Reform Bills therefore cannot be regarded as the *causes* of other changes, but rather as the joint *effects* with these other changes of alterations in public sentiment. Sentiment, being itself invisible, can only be gauged by the more conspicuous innovations it causes. And there is a natural tendency to attribute to such a colossal innovation as a Reform Bill effects which are in reality derived from the deep psychological motions of the whole people. Similarly there is little to be feared—or hoped—from such a measure as manhood suffrage or woman suffrage, though the alteration in public sentiment which produces a demand for these measures may very possibly be fraught with other momentous consequences. The true danger of the future is not in the passing of this or that measure, nor in the abolition of this or that institution, but in a degradation of public feeling. And this is affected far more by the writers, the newspapers, and less visible agencies than by politics. Politicians in fact are the froth on the wave of sentiment which has generally arisen from an altogether different source. In this connexion there remains to be observed that changes of feeling are of necessity slow in taking place. The statement is of universal truth. Sudden affections, sudden friendships are often very intense, but they do not last. A sudden fit of anger is over the more quickly in proportion to its violence. The reason lies in the minute structure of the nervous system, which cannot tolerate any sudden large addition. An emotion implies a structure in the brain to support it, and organic substance cannot grow a new structure except slowly. But when an emotion and its corresponding structure have become formed, the eradication of it must similarly be a prolonged process. Thus we see that the mercurial temperament of the French, running everywhere into extremes of short duration, has resulted in no higher an average political advancement than on this side of the Channel, where feeling has moved in the same direction, but more steadily and less jerkily.

From this illustration of the manner in which political institutions are founded on the feelings of the people, let us pass to ceremonial institutions; and let us single out for examination that which is commonly considered as the extreme of fickleness, and of remoteness from scientific law—we refer, of course, to fashion as illustrated in ladies' dresses. We purpose to show how fashion is in close and

immediate dependence upon the most fundamental emotions of the people.

It has again and again been observed with unbroken unanimity by travellers among primitive races that in complete nakedness there is no indecency. Indecency would of course arise if in a clothed population two or three people went about unclothed. But in an unclothed population, even the European eye accustomed to European manners finds not the smallest trace of impropriety. Indeed, we may go much farther than this, and affirm that in an unclothed population indecency is at once ascribed to anyone who should don even such modest apparel as a fig-leaf. Solid and reliable evidence has been brought forward by Professor Westermarck to show that clothing was, in the first instance, invented and worn by women for the purpose of attracting the attentions of men. In short, the essence of indecency is not in exposure, but in *concealment with suggestiveness*. This fact, inductively reached, is borne out by deduction. We may remark, *en passant*, that this truth forms an excellent illustration of the shortcomings of the subjective method in sociology. What civilised man, by trying to imagine himself a savage, would ever have arrived at this theory of the origin of clothing, which objective methods have discovered? We are told, then, that clothing in its origin rested upon the sexual feelings of the people; and some would say that the vagaries of modern fashion have no other basis.

That institutions are the product of human character, and especially of human emotions, is tolerably well recognised. That beliefs rest upon the same foundation is also generally admitted and hardly requires illustration. It will not, however, be superfluous to illustrate one or two of the more circuitous modes in which emotion affects belief—modes which are not apparent at first sight. It will then be our task to apply our results to an interpretation of some of the characteristics of primitive and advanced civilisations.

The interchangeability of emotions, the sudden transformation of one into another apparently quite different, is an interesting and little noted phenomenon. The existence of an emotion implies a very energetic or intensive cerebral activity. It may be looked upon as a massive presence in the brain which, though it cannot be eradicated except by time, is liable to undergo conversion and find its outlet in a changed direction. The sudden transformations of the religious emotion into something which at first would seem wholly opposed to it is a not infrequent occurrence. Great love may turn to great

hate, but it cannot turn to indifference except after prolonged waiting. Great love itself can only be acquired by time. Love at first sight, or after a week's acquaintance, however extreme, quickly dwindles unless it is kept alive by continued intimacy, or by some extraneous circumstance which invests the affair with importance or romance : and then the emotions induced by these may add constant fuel to the original flame. So also extreme anger may turn in a moment to compassion or to laughter. A vulgar performance in a music-hall does not leave an emotional person indifferent : the nature of it is to excite some emotion which may be one of disgust, or of amusement, or of anger ; or which may change from one to the other. A baby that is tickled is overcome either with laughter or with anger. In all these cases the same stimulus arouses emotion to much the same degree of intensity, whatever the character of the emotion ; and almost any emotion of given intensity is transferable into any other emotion of equal intensity : the intensity of the emotion being, within limits, a joint product of the stimulus and the time in which it acts, while the character of the emotion is dependent upon the conditions of the moment, and is liable to immediate alteration with those conditions. The unexpected workings of this law demand one or two instances. All enlightened religions specifically condemn cruelty and enjoin kindness. But the *religious emotion* is prone to pass direct into the *emotion of cruelty* ; and thus we get the anomalous result of the Inquisition which, in the name of God, broke the direct laws of God. The intensity of the emotion aroused by the witnessing of tortures was an equivalent of the intensity of the religious emotions of the torturers. Another unexpected example of the same law is found in the close association between sadness and humour. Many of the most humorous persons have been persons whose lives were overhung with sad events. The humour in Plato's Dialogues sprang from the melancholy character of Plato. The light and witty Molière was one of the austere of men. A talent for writing tragedies is apt to be associated with a talent for writing comedies. Many curious transformations of the moral emotions may similarly be observed : indeed, this being one of the deepest of human feelings, is also one of the richest in examples of our present thesis. The so-called man of the world—that is a man who usually lays little stress on the minor requirements of morality—is apt to have a kinder outlook upon life at large than one whose mental attitude is one of remonstrance against the prevalent wickedness of mankind. A general unamiableness towards men is apt to pass into moral

condemnation of men. The feeling of opposition is thus made to justify itself. By morally condemning another man we have firstly the agreeable feeling of our own superiority; secondly we feel justified and in fact praiseworthy in disliking him—otherwise an unchristian feeling. Hence it is that we are exceedingly prone to condemn a man's action as morally wrong when he happens to have raised in us a strongly disagreeable emotion: in such cases those in whom no disagreeable emotion is raised are not able to detect any moral delinquency. Hence also it is that those who are most given to condemning others are those whose attitude in general is the least charitable and amiable. The condemnation in such cases does not spring from superior virtue in the critic; it springs from hostile emotions towards humanity which have contracted a vicious habit of passing over into moral emotions.

The sexual sphere offers one of the richest fields for gathering instances of emotional transference: but the discovery of these, plain enough as many of them are, may be left to the ingenuity of the reader. We may however cite a very extreme example from the insect world in the habits of the strange creature known as the Praying Mantis (*Mantis religiosa*). As soon as the male has done his duty towards the female, she invariably proceeds to recompense him by biting his head off and eating him up. That is to say the passion persists, but passes into cruelty or cannibalism. The case is not affected by the fact that even in the midst of his duties the female sometimes twists round her neck and nips off her lover's head.*

The lesson to be drawn from these various examples is that while conduct and belief in the individual are always the product of emotion, they are not always the product of the emotion which is most obvious on the surface. A is a successful rival of B in competition for some appointment. B thereupon has engendered in him emotions of hostility towards A. But B is a good Christian and will not consciously harbour jealousy. The emotion imperatively demands recognition, and rapidly is transformed into some other emotion which B can harbour without scruple, usually a moral emotion

* See 'Mœurs des Insectes,' par J. H. Fabre (Paris 1911). 'Le mâle, recueilli dans ses vitales fonctions, tient la femelle étroitement enlacée. Mais le malheureux n'a pas de tête; il n'a pas de col, presque pas de corsage. L'autre, le museau retourné sur l'épaule, continue de ronger, fort paisible, les restes du doux amant. Et ce tronçon masculin, solidement cramponné, continue sa besogne!'

against A on account of actions which in other circumstances would have excited no comment. There then exists in B a *true* motive and an *apparent* motive: the apparent motive is the moral indignation against A which B not only proclaims but truly feels, for the jealousy has *de facto* absolutely been converted into moral indignation. The net result from A's point of view is the same: for B commences an attack upon him. This particular instance, though so common that everyone must have observed it at one time or another, is exemplary and explanatory of a very large part of human conduct. Everywhere we see conduct and beliefs resting upon emotion; but usually the emotion is more or less transformed from some other emotion. In investigating conduct we have not only to take into account the apparent motive but to look for a true motive, often deeply concealed, and estimate how far the apparent motive has displaced the true motive. The futility of argument generally rests upon the circumstance that the arguments are directed only against the foundations of the *apparent* motive, and not against those of the *true* motive. Thus in the above instance, A finding allegations made against him by B will endeavour to assuage B's moral indignation by upholding the morality of his proceedings. But B will not be assuaged, because this does not touch the *true* motive, and the moral indignation is *only* an apparent motive. Let A meet B, however, with something to appease jealousy, and B's moral indignation will be undermined. Indeed, A's ordinary action in such a case, to uphold his own morality, is very apt to enhance rather than diminish B's indignation; for it fixes the attention of both on the moral question, and erecting that into the main issue, draws the mind altogether off the original true motive and confirms B in his attitude of moral feeling. In many a case in real life A has gone to the wall through accepting the moral question as a true issue and entering upon a discussion with regard to it, with all the attendant risk of misrepresentation, and the enormous tactical disadvantage of being on the defensive. This exchange of jealousy into moral indignation is one of the commonest examples of emotional change; for jealousy is one of the ugliest of feelings, which no one likes to confess: while morality is one of the highest, which everyone likes to display. And in consequence, moral motives have very much less influence in the world than the superficial observer would imagine; while the disagreeable and egotistic motives, in vicarious clothing, guide men's conduct to an extent little appreciated by the public at large.

We said just now that it was of little use trying to put

ourselves into the position of primitive man. Few adults are capable of figuring to themselves the sentiments and motives even of their own young children ; and very many people are for ever misinterpreting the motives even of their best friends. We concluded that the only practicable method was the objective method employed in every other science : to put ourselves entirely outside the subject, and inquire how our human puppets are worked by physiological or psychological forces. With the view of ascertaining what psychological forces had to be reckoned, we have glanced at the formation of motives among civilised men with whom we are familiar. We have now to carry our explanation back to the less familiar primitive man to see how his conduct can be explained under our organon.

We find that primitive man is immensely inferior to civilised man in intellectual capacity : we find no such marked inferiority in emotional capacity. It is true that those emotions which we call the higher emotions—namely, those that are linked with advanced intellectual conceptions—have little scope among savage men. But in pure unintellectual feeling, in anger, in fear, in reverence, in tenderness, no great differences of intensity can be observed between civilised and savage man : such differences as exist being apparently not unfavourable to the savage. In active conduct, too, they are not markedly different from the civilised, except in so far that their activities are comparatively purposeless and unintellectual. The fundamental difference therefore is intellectual. The savage has not the positive knowledge nor the reasoning capacity of his civilised cousin ; and intellectual operations as a whole enter very much less into his mental life. Now we have found that even among the civilised emotion mainly causes belief and guides conduct. Among the uncivilised, therefore, we must expect to find it guiding conduct and belief almost exclusively. And here appears to us a serious flaw in Spencer's system of sociology. He adopts the principle that the belief of a savage is in all cases that which to him in the state of knowledge he has attained is the most rational. He regards the savage as reaching his conclusions by a chain of reasoning which constitutes a logically sound series of deductions, but which are false because the premisses were inadequate. We do not deny that the premisses are inadequate, but we do deny that there is anything suggestive of logic or rational deduction in the reasoning from them. So far from obtaining his beliefs by deduction from premisses, adequate or inadequate, we conceive that they are caused directly by his predominant emotions. One of the most predominant and ever-present

emotions in savages is the emotion of fear. This emotion *creates* corresponding belief: it *creates* objects of terror everywhere: it *creates* spirits, ghosts, gods which have this in common, that they instil fear. And in attempting to account for the belief in supernatural beings which appear to us so grotesque, fear in combination with other similar emotions is altogether a sufficient and complete explanation. Elaborate attempts to show how the savage deduces his beliefs from the facts at his disposal are beside the mark. If may, indeed, be as Spencer asserted, that all supernatural beings are deduced from the ghosts of deceased ancestors; but the *causa causans*, the really important factor in the creation of these beliefs, is emotional and not intellectual. Spencer in the attempt to put himself in the place of primitive man only gave his attention to suppressing his intellectuality. He failed to bring out the emotionality of the savage. Spencer himself, the very embodiment of intellect with all the simpler emotions suppressed, depicts the savage as a miniature Spencer, and his mythology as a miniature Synthetic Philosophy. He never could have appreciated the emotional heat of a savage so as to *feel* how it actuated him. No intellectualised modern ever could.

The feelings of obedience and reverence are also natural to primitive man, and are greatly intensified by the political state of society in which he lives. To extremely tyrannical methods of government a strong sense of subordination and feeling in favour of obedience are the correlatives. And just as the roaring lion walks about 'seeking whom he may devour,' so the submissive spirit goes about seeking whom he may obey. In the unintellectual savage there is no check to prevent the emotions from creating the means for their own satisfaction, and the emotion of obedience quickly raises up fictitious beings who exact obedience. Again we insist that the belief in such beings is adequately and completely explained by the existence of the emotion. The deity of a primitive man, then, is a hotch-potch of his prevailing emotions. If his natural environment has cultivated in him the emotion of fear, his god will be a terrifying individual. If it induces in him a submissive meekness, his god will be a stern stickler for obedience and prone to wrath. Jealousy gives rise to a 'jealous god.' If the tender emotions preoccupy him, his god is a god of love. If the moral emotions move him deeply, his god will be represented as enjoining moral codes, enforced by punishments, barbarous or mild, according as the savage's emotions are cruel or kindly. And just as we find that the emotions of morality only attain ascendancy in comparatively advanced civilisations, so we

find that only in such civilisations are the gods associated with the maintenance of morality.

Primitive man, while thus manufacturing subjectively his own gods, gives them as concrete a form as his intellect will allow. Idol-worship and fetish-worship follow almost necessarily from a state of mind of low intellectual power. They are not intellectual creations, as Spencer would urge, deduced from the results of prior observation or superstition: they are directly opposed to intellectual discrimination. And as intellect advances, these beliefs become less and less tenable. The emotions still assert their sway, however, and still create beliefs; but the beliefs become less concrete and realistic: they recede into ethereal dimness where the rising power of intellect can see them less plainly; and as the flowing intellectual tide encroaches ever more insistently on the sway of feeling, these ghostly spectres of poor, trembling humanity are at last driven clean out of the field of belief.

We arrive, then, at the conclusion that the emotions of any people are more or less accurately portrayed in the characters of their gods; but modifications have to be made in the case of the most advanced societies. There to a great extent beliefs are founded upon reason, and not upon feeling. But the main obstacles to reason remain as before the emotions or prejudices. By asking what the prevailing emotions are, we learn what are the chief obstacles with which reason has to contend. As has been already pointed out, the chief attribute of deities among advanced peoples is that of custodians of morality; and this is undoubtedly associated with the fact that the moral sentiments are profoundly rooted among these advanced peoples. In short, that is probably one of the main reasons for their having advanced. But this important and beneficent emotion in favour of morality is just as hostile to intellectual processes as less desirable emotions. We find people's beliefs formed not by intellectual perception of external facts, but created by their moral desires and feelings. They tend to believe in the existence of anything which draws out their moral feelings. They are prone to attach moral significance to scientific laws. The actions of men at large are tinged with a moral or immoral flavour. Humanity is divided into sheep and goats. Contrasted with this is the markedly a-moral attitude of modern science. Science is as far removed from immorality as it is from morality: for base emotions perturb the intellect no less than noble emotions; but morality is excluded altogether from its scope and from its point of view. As morality is fortunately one of the deepest emotions of the

present time, so unfortunately it constitutes one of the greatest obstacles to clear intellectual perception. And we may notice in the advance from primitive to modern ideas a progressive decrease in the moral colouring of the knowledge acquired. We lay special emphasis on this fact, as we do not wish it to be supposed that it is only bad feelings that affect the intellect. The highest feelings do so no less, and it would very probably be a great disaster if the people generally were to exchange deep moral sentiments for the frigid impartiality of a scientific and immaculately truthful outlook. Truth is the one solitary and complete aim of science, but it is only one among many conflicting factors in reaching the welfare of humanity; a welfare which always has been and must continue to remain largely due to the prevalence of beliefs that are untrue and erroneous but wholesome.

We must therefore look upon primitive ideas as the product of emotion, and their gradual supersession by advanced ideas as the gradual contraction of emotional influence upon belief. External facts at first impress themselves upon the savage through the medium of his feelings, which reflect the environment in a distorted and unreal caricature: they ultimately impress themselves upon the intellectual mind, and are reflected with the faithfulness of a polished mirror. Such being the true foundations of primitive belief, is it useful or possible to attempt to trace any logical connexion between its various phases? How any particular belief actually arose appears to be so much a matter of chance as to preclude any reasoned exposition of it. Probably the concrete shape of each belief is due to some wholly insignificant and untraceable events. The emotions determine that there shall be belief of a specified kind: the chance suggestion of a moment may determine into what particular channel the waters shall flow.

‘ Trifles light as air
Are to the jealous confirmations strong
As proofs of holy writ.’ *

Anybody may observe how readily people will entertain a foolish belief on the slightest suggestion, if it is calculated to produce an emotion in them, and is not immediately opposed to intellectual discrimination.†

* *Othello* iii. 3.

† Mr. Keary in his ‘*Pursuit of Reason*’ criticises the ‘anthropological predisposition’ expressed in this Review, and especially singles out our statement that ‘among primitive men untrue

We submit, then, that the most profitable method of studying the 'Descriptive Sociology' is to make first a careful study of the mental characteristics of the people, and to interpret the facts in the light of our conclusions. Take, for instance, the Chinese. Emotionally, we are informed, they are

'gregarious, mild, frugal, sober, industrious, of remarkable endurance, cowardly, revengeful, very cruel, unsympathetic, mendacious, thievish, libidinous, not ungrateful, excessively courteous and ceremonious among themselves; very high sense of mercantile honour.' Intellectually they are 'non-progressive, slaves to uniformity and mechanism in culture, and following ancient stereotyped forms in every department of thought and action, unimaginative, uncreative, imitative, lacking free individuality and original force, slow in organising, torpid, lacking reflection and foresight, incapable of grasping a subject in a comprehensive and practical manner, inaccurate, talent for misunderstanding and indirection, suspicious, superstitious, vague in expressing thoughts.'

One of the outstanding features of the Chinese character is the extremely low developement of capacity for physical sensation. This single fact alone explains much of the information in Mr. Werner's tables. It explains for one thing their extreme cruelty. Indifference to physical pain in oneself is accompanied with a still greater indifference with regard to other people. It goes far to explain their excessive and (to European ideas) ridiculous courtesy. For, being on the whole well-disposed towards their fellow-men, they naturally wish to convey respect in addressing each other. But extreme insensitiveness prevents them from appreciating the more delicate compliments of civilised humanity. In order to be appreciated, the compli-

beliefs are certainly more common' than true beliefs. As the statement alludes to the subjects embraced under the headings Philosophy, Science, Religion, we confess we never thought we should be called upon to defend so palpable a truth. Mr. Keary's criticism runs: 'Were that so, true beliefs would be to primitive men something out of the way: and we should have that powerful factor, love of the marvellous, tending to make men form just judgements. I am sure the writer did not desire to arrive at such a conclusion.' The writer certainly did not: and we are at a loss to imagine how Mr. Keary got to it. The conclusion is the more remarkable, since we had been pointing out that 'love of the marvellous' was an important factor in warping men's judgements. Not only, therefore, is the deduction which Mr. Keary attempts to foist upon us altogether unwarranted by anything in our premisses, but it is directly opposed to the deduction which we ourselves drew in the most explicit manner from those premisses.

ments must be laid on so thick that a European would be disgusted or amused. An analogy will make the matter clearer. If we wish to please a high-bred dog, we stroke it gently on the back. But if we wish to gratify a farmyard pig, we violently scrape its back with the metal ferrule of our walking-stick. The agreeable sensation thus produced in the pig is similar to the sensation which milder measures produce in the dog. In the same way extremely exaggerated forms of speech are necessary to produce the same pleasant feeling in a Chinaman that the lightest word would produce in a cultivated European. Their industriousness likewise is more due to incapacity for feeling fatigue than to any higher quality. That they are said to be libidinous would appear to be in opposition to our present view. But that fact may much more easily be attributed to lack of any restraining faculty than to any real intensity of feeling. That there is no such real intensity is pretty conclusively proved by the fact that their art is generally free from immoral suggestions—a very fair criterion. Again we see the physical insensitiveness of the Chinese in the fact that ‘cleanliness and comfort are almost unknown.’ The air of their cities is polluted by foul stench. The women deform their feet by binding.* Pious children cut off pieces of their own flesh as medicine for their sick parents; and a priest as evidence of merit cuts off one of his fingers, or burns marks on his head. And here we come upon the fact that, while extremely low as regards physical sensation, they possess certain emotions in fairly high degree. Reverence is one of the most conspicuous of these: a fact which appears not only in their treatment of parents, but also in their moral and religious ideas, the latter of which, we are told, centres mainly in reverence for ancestors, though its outward forms vary between Confucian Agnosticism, Taoism, Buddhism, Islam, Shamanism, and Christianity. The same feeling helps to maintain the military type of structure which still lies at the root of Chinese civilisation.

Utterly different in character from the Chinese are the Hellenic Greeks, dealt with in vol. x. of the ‘*Descriptive Sociology*.’ The most striking difference at first aspect is in the size of the communities and the country where they live. The Chinese, a vast community, inhabit a country in which extensive plains are a significant feature. Of the two million square miles constituting the eighteen provinces of China proper, the

* As, indeed, European women do to a much smaller extent. The comparative insensibility to pain in the feet is very possibly due to their great distance from the nerve centres.

northern portion is one large plain, the east and the south are level interspersed with hills, and only the west has a mountainous character. Three great rivers flow into the sea, and about thirty others of considerable size, with tributaries reaching every part of the country. Greece, on the other hand, was in area about equal to Scotland; the extreme length being 250 miles, and the extreme breadth 180 miles. It 'is a land of mountains and small valleys; it has few plains of even moderate size, and no considerable rivers.' The remarkable contrast in the inorganic environment between the Chinese and the Hellenic Greeks produces or accompanies an equally marked contrast in the characteristics of the people. The one a very large community, unprogressive but stable, singularly slow in the appreciation of new ideas: the other a small community, or rather a collection of small communities, highly progressive but wholly unstable, reaching a high development of philosophic ideas. With 'an extremely high degree of creative activity in all branches of science and art' went a lack of reverence that led them to ridicule their own gods in their comedies, or even to censure them as in the tragedies of Euripides.* Many facts indicate their extreme physical sensitiveness. Their keen love of pleasure was universal: they hated old age, and in Athenian tragedy and comedy treated it with contempt. Mutilations were rare, and then mainly confined to slaves, though the women bored their ears for rings. In the Homeric period loyalty was rare. In short, a generalisation from Greek and Chinese alone would seem to indicate that a high degree of intellectual progressiveness is accompanied by high physical sensibility—a suggestion further borne out by the well-known fact that idiots and the feeble-minded generally are of all persons the least susceptible to physical pain or discomfort. Herbert Spencer in his 'Principles of Sociology' has set down indifference to pain as one of the characteristics of primitive man, with which goes hardness of all kinds and an apathetic emotional condition.

The volume of 'Descriptive Sociology' dealing with Hellenic Greeks begins at the Mycenaean period and closes with the death of Philip of Macedon. Few periods of ancient history have been so fruitful with regard to the progress of civilisation. Starting in very early times from Minos, King of Crete, we

* We are reminded of Voltaire, the most active creative genius of the eighteenth century, and to whom apparently the emotion of reverence was altogether unknown.

descend to the early poets of the colonisation period, Archilochus, Simonides, Mimnermus. Passing by the names of famous tyrants, Cleisthenes, Pisistratus, Polyerates, etc., we find in this period the lyric poets Alcaeus, Sappho, Anacreon, and Aleman, many sculptors and founders in bronze, and lawgivers like Solon. Later still there are the politicians Cleisthenes, Aristides, Themistocles, Pericles, and lastly Demosthenes. But a more urgent claim on our present attention arises from the fact that the present era includes the dawn of philosophy. Thales, the father of philosophy, was born in the colonisation period, and the next 300 years down to the end of our era witnessed the vast expansion of philosophic and scientific ideas that culminated with Plato. Aristotle, the greatest of the ancients, is just excluded from our period; but it will be an interesting study of early modes of thought if we pass in review the philosophers from Thales to Plato and attempt to understand how they formed their ideas.

The commencement of philosophy took place when men enlarged their inquiries as to how this thing or that thing came to pass to the widest question of all, how the universe came to pass. Prior to the fixation of attention on this point, the scattered ideas of mankind about causation had led them into diverse systems of polytheism, in which a number of gods were invoked to explain the various occurrences which happened to attract attention. But as growing intelligence gradually became conscious of the unity of Nature, there arose a corresponding tendency to search for unity of cause, and to rest dissatisfied with the attribution of a special cause to every special phenomenon that called for explanation. The culmination of this intellectual tendency was taken in the sixth century before Christ. It resulted in the East in the displacement by Buddhism of the remnants of polytheism; it resulted among the Hebrews in the exchange of Elohim for Jehovah; and it resulted among the Greeks in the severance of philosophy from religion, and the initiation of an entirely new series of ideas. At the back of this movement among the Greeks was a desire to find a universal cause, and the strong desire thus entertained led them, in the manner we have already described, to attribute causality to almost anything that their fancy might happen to light upon—however ridiculous to more advanced intelligence such attributions might be. Thus Thales regarded water as the origin of all things; Anaximenes regarded air as the primal element. Diogenes of Apollonia followed Anaximenes, but identified air with soul (*ψυχή*) or intelligence, thus sowing the germs of a more spiritualistic theory. These early philosophers, bracketed

together as the Ionian school, were content with taking these concrete objects and calling them the origin of the universe. The Ionian school was succeeded by the Mathematical school, in which ideas somewhat more abstract begin to appear. Anaximander of Miletus hit upon infinity as the origin of all things : for, he asked, how can any single finite thing be the origin of *all* things ? Pythagoras went farther, and looked upon number in the abstract as being the goal of their search, and he erected into special favour the primary number one. And here let us pause to warn the reader, lest he should think Greek philosophy somewhat abstruse, not to seek too closely into the meaning of these grotesque speculations. People are apt to miss the point of primitive speculation by supposing it to have a meaning much deeper than appears on the surface ; and they are apt also to deliver themselves of profound interpretations which would have greatly startled the founders of the theory, and been far beyond their comprehension. The Pythagorean apotheosis of number has in it nothing more abstruse than the Ionic apotheoses of air and water ; save only that number being abstract, the theory is not quite such an obvious contradiction of sense-impressions. It is an example of the way in which, as the old causes are gradually seen to be more and more untenable, they gradually become more misty and abstract ; and by ever-increasing unintelligibility endeavour to keep without the growing sphere of intelligence. In precisely the same manner the Hegelianism of the present day would instantly fall to earth with all its mazy absurdities, if it were not protected from intellectual analysis by the astonishing subtlety and incomprehensibility of its substance.

A further advance was made by the Eleatic school, which combined the more reasonable elements in the Ionian and the Mathematical. Xenophanes, inheriting the doctrine of the One from Pythagoras, amplified it, as Aristotle tells us : ‘ Casting ‘his eyes upwards at the immensity of Heaven, he declared ‘that the One is God.’ He thus founded philosophic monotheism or pantheism. Parmenides followed in the footsteps of Xenophanes, though he was perturbed by the question whether there could exist such a thing as non-existence. Zeno of Elea further elaborated the doctrine of the One. He was a thorough-going disciple of Parmenides, and devoted himself mainly to spreading the views of the latter. At this time cosmological speculation was getting rather into difficulties. Zeno was propounding the famous paradox of Achilles and the tortoise : and he was likewise proving for the benefit of his contemporaries that motion was impossible. For the philosophical ‘ moderate

'men' of those days it must have been a relief to turn to Heraclitus' new gospel that fire was the origin of all things.

Here however we enter upon a new epoch in Greek philosophy. For a century and a half speculation had been rife as to the origin of the universe, and it was felt that the explanation was not much nearer than before. The attention of philosophers was therefore naturally directed to problems of the limitation of knowledge, and whether the explanation sought for was, after all, one that could be brought within the confines of human understanding. Ontological inquiry gave place to epistemological inquiry. But before following it into this new phase, let us note how the theories described above agree with our observations on primitive thought. It is clear that all these philosophers were animated by one common emotion or sentiment—the strong desire to ascertain the ultimate cause. And we have seen how some invoked water, some air, some infinity, some number, some fire as the goal of their desire. In short, the prevalent desire seized upon any handy object and erected it forthwith to the desiderated eminence. It would be chasing a Will-o'-the-wisp to seek how they came by these particular concepts. The adequate explanation is afforded by the desire for a first cause appropriating to itself whatever it required for its own gratification. To the logical inquirer their beliefs are unintelligible: to the psychological inquirer they bear their explanation on the surface.

Hastening on now to our next epoch, we find philosophers dilating upon the uncertainty of knowledge derived from the senses. This doubtless represents a true intellectual advance—the gradually strengthening discrimination between the objective and the subjective. It made possible great progress in the efforts to interpret natural phenomena; but it lent itself unfortunately to the wildest speculation, on the principle that the obvious contradiction afforded by the senses was no true criterion. Of Heraclitus we need say but little. His sobriquet of 'the obscure' shows plainly enough that he availed himself of the privilege still extensively utilised by metaphysicians—to shroud absurd hypotheses beneath inscrutable obscurity of language. Anaxagoras was a far more interesting thinker. He denied that there was any such thing as either fate or chance, thus curiously anticipating modern science; and he affirmed that intelligence was the moving force of the universe, thus anticipating modern theology. His mental attitude, as Lewes has said, cannot have been far removed from that of very many thinking people of the present day—the conception of a divine intelligence acting through invariable

laws. On the whole he drew a just line between the provinces of reason and of sense; but he was not afraid of paradox. His attempt to prove that snow was black shows that at all events he was no bigoted believer in sense-impressions, and dimly reminds us of the grotesque proposition which Hegel laid down for the delectation of his disciples past and present—*Sein und Nichtsein ist dasselbe*.

Empedocles greatly improved the cosmology of the Ionian school by affirming that, instead of one primary element, there were four—earth, air, fire, and water. Whether this achievement induced in him the complaint known to moderns by the irreverent title of 'swelled head' we cannot say; but he proclaimed himself a god, and appears to have been treated as such by his adherents. Democritus was in many ways an advance upon Anaxagoras and Empedocles: he insisted upon the universality of law; and his propositions concerning motion are decidedly suggestive of Newton. He took the question of his predecessors, 'How do we perceive external 'things?' and their answer, 'We perceive them by the senses'; and appears to have been affected with some doubt whether this answer was of the profundity ascribed to it by enthusiasts, or whether its originator was justified in thinking himself a god. At all events he embarked upon a complicated theory of *εἶδωλα* in which it will be needless to follow him. The attentive reader will have observed how, out of the emotional quagmire, there is emerging an ever-increasing respect for objective fact, and an ever-increasing etherealisation or retreat into subtle obscurity of all those conclusions which are supported by sentiment or desire alone. Let us pass on then to Protagoras and the sophists.

The rise of the sophists marks a period when general discontent with the methods and conclusions of philosophy was rife. Disgusted with the failure of all attempts at the acquisition of positive knowledge, they took refuge in a scepticism that was scarcely less injurious to the ultimate discovery of truth. For their scepticism did not take the form of a wholesome distrust of untried hypotheses: it led them to doubt the very existence of truth itself. Thus they used to boast that they could 'make the worse appear the better cause.' They recognised neither absolute right nor absolute truth, and fell back upon expediency as the proper test of action and belief. Protagoras affirmed that man was the measure of all things, and emphatically insisted upon the relativity of knowledge. In some ways the sophist movement presents a parallel to the pragmatist movement of the present day. In each case

the new scepticism originates as a protest against the failure of pre-existing philosophy: in each case the possibility of absolute truth is denied: in each case the opinion of mankind is taken as the criterion of relative truth and the proper guide to action. But whatever there may be of truth in this way of looking at things, it is of no greater value to the philosopher than it would be to the statesman to know the number of inches between London and Berlin. Scepticism, agnosticism, attitudes of doubt altogether, are useful as temporary phases, but are quite devoid of finality. To erect scepticism into a philosophic dogma is to confound the means with the end; to confuse the preliminary attitude of waiting expectancy with the final attitude of knowledge attained. Nothing in the world is so positive as knowledge and truth; and the negative religion of doubt is the refuge of timid and diffident epochs which, to avoid stagnation of humanity, must soon make way for constructive beliefs on a more solid foundation than before.

This at all events was the fate which befell the sophists in the progressive Hellenic communities of the fifth century B.C. In the height of their wealth and their power, there arose from among the poorer classes a mind of Gargantuan force which with no sort of fuss or display proceeded to knock them down like ninepins, one after the other. The rise of Socrates marks an epoch in the intellectual progress of the world. Not less subtle-minded than his adversaries, he greatly surpassed them in mental strength and vigour; and accordingly we are once more brought out from the misty obscurity that had again overtaken philosophy into a land of plain and comprehensible propositions—propositions with which we may disagree, which we may think immoral as the Athenians did, but which have an honest and unmistakeable meaning, with no cloudy diction to envelope its weaknesses. Thus, though Socrates' views have the little intrinsic value that was alone possible in his time, he is an immense advance on any of his predecessors; and, in our opinion, his greatest title to fame rests entirely upon his giving definiteness to thought, his mortal hatred of obscurity, his determination that anyone who held a belief should be compelled to recognise all the implications of his belief. He came as an innovator in method. Against the rhetoric of the sophists he brought with deadly effect the weapon of dialectics. Professing himself to know nothing, he would approach one of the sophist teachers and commence to cross-examine him, as though for his own information. With relentless certainty, the adversary was driven by corollaries from his own theories into some self-contradictory or absurd

position, where Socrates would leave him in impotent fury. Naturally, this attack upon the dominant set of his time resulted in extreme unpopularity in influential quarters. Naturally, also, this strong antagonistic feeling, on the principles already sketched, would rapidly become converted into moral indignation—such being the usual course of emotions caused by jealousy or defeat—and Socrates, as everyone knows, was accused of wrong-doing and put to death. The fact that he was the most moral and the most religious man of his time was powerless to save him from charges of immorality and irreligion when the animosity of his countrymen was raised against him. We may be reminded of a greater teacher than Socrates who some centuries later was barbarously put to death with the lowest criminals. No virtue and no elevation of character can ever protect from wholesale accusations of degeneracy and wickedness one who raises passion.

The only further observation to be made on Socrates' philosophy is that it was prompted and vitiated mainly by his excessive desire for morality. He believed that knowledge was identical with virtue; that morality was the only science; that every other study was futile and absurd. In short, his philosophy was based upon emotion, not upon intellect; and the fact that the emotion was a noble one must not blind us to the essential deficiencies of the result. He was strongly imbued with a sense of the purposiveness of the universe; but here again we see his beliefs inertly following his feelings. With Socrates philosophy lost much of its intellectual element of pure scientific inquiry; but it gained a moral flavour which it has never since entirely lost. Henceforward the deep-rooted moral emotions formed the foundation of the philosophy of a wide section of humanity. In substance there was perhaps a slight intellectual retrogression; but in form, in the clear definiteness and condemnation of ambiguity, the progress of knowledge was enormously accelerated.

We may pass over Euclid of Megara and the gay Aristippus, whose philosophy was too plainly rooted in feeling, and come at once to the cynics—an eminently interesting psychological study. The system of Antisthenes was, as Lewes has observed, essentially personal. His character was of so gloomy and morose a kind as to earn for him the sobriquet of 'The Dog,' and ultimately to drive from him all but his successor Diogenes. Antisthenes it was who, on hearing that he was praised by many, asked what he had done, then, that was wrong. This savage trend of feeling gave origin to an equally savage philosophy in which the Socratic search for virtue took on the most

austere and forbidding character. But the egotism which usually inspires the whole troop of cynics and ascetics was not lost upon the master Socrates. He criticised the shabby dress ostentatiously affected by Antisthenes. 'I see your vanity, Antisthenes, peering through holes in your cloak.' Plato similarly detected the mainspring of Diogenes' beliefs. Diogenes had entered Plato's house during an entertainment, and trampling on the rich carpets said 'Thus I trample on the pride of Plato'; to which Plato gave the immediate repartee 'With greater pride, O Diogenes.' Diogenes is the classical example of a man whose normally unamiable feelings towards humanity found expression in vehement moral indignation against them, and in vain and ostentatious assumptions of superiority. His tub and his interview with Alexander are known to all. It was his constant complaint that there was no manhood among the people; they were nothing but women and children. He it was who lit a lamp and peered about the streets as though looking for something; on being asked what he sought, he replied 'A man.' Again, at Sparta, he once called out 'Approach, all men.' And when they had approached, he beat them back with his club, saying 'I called for men; ye are excrements.' Diogenes also illustrates the close conjunction between asceticism and sensuality.

A new epoch in philosophy now opens with the famous name of Plato. In the brief space remaining it is impossible to do justice to this great man: a few lines must suffice. He represented an immense advance on anything that had gone before. He freed philosophy once more from the limitations set upon it by Socrates; and substituted a more scientific feeling for truth in place of the strong sense of ethical requirements. Yet he added very little, except stimulation, of permanent value to knowledge; and the modern regard for him appears to us not a little exaggerated. He deified the subjective method. Grote has remarked that his theories are altogether *a priori*: 'They enunciate preconceptions or hypotheses which derive their hold upon his belief not from any aptitude for solving the objections he has raised, but from deep and solemn sentiment of some kind or other—religious, ethical, aesthetical, poetical, etc., the worship of numerical symmetry or exactness, etc.' In short, he first decided what was true by appealing to his own sense of what was beautiful or good, etc., and therefore ought to be true, and he proceeded to apply his hypothesis to the facts, which had to be twisted about until they fitted the preconceptions. Can we wonder at the many absurdities into which he fell, as, for

instance, proving that the world is an animal! He not only formed his ideas in the manner we have attributed to all primitive ideas, but he did so consciously, affirming and believing that this was the real way to finding truth. And here we terminate the era of philosophy that comes within the scope of this article. We have seen how, now advancing, now retiring, the course of thought is influenced and controlled by the emotions of the thinkers. We have seen that primitive philosophy, like all primitive ideas, is impossible to understand on a basis of logic, but at once interpreted on a basis of psychology.

What are the moral qualities that are necessary in the student of 'Descriptive Sociology'? First, a strong and passionate feeling for truth. Since emotion is the mainspring of belief, we may now add that the only way to keep out foreign emotions is for the whole mind to be already in the complete occupation of the emotion for truth. In sociological studies emotional negation, such as might be attained in mathematics, is impossible. Sociology brings us into contact with the foundations of everything we have been taught to believe, to admire, to wish for. Were our minds unoccupied by emotion, we should be met at almost every turn by gusts of passing sentiment or passion which would catch our intellectual concepts and blow them about with no power of resistance or control. Only by a deep feeling for truth already filling the mind, and more powerful than any other feeling which assails it, can the intellectual machine be made to work in harmony with objective fact. We do not mean by truth the mere accurate retailing of facts to others: we mean the far rarer virtue of accurately retailing them to ourselves, even though we may desire them to go no farther.

A second moral requisite is no other than the Scriptural law of charity. Few things mark off men from one another more than their tendencies to judge others. 'Judge not, that ye be not judged' might form a motto for everyone who sets out to study human character. Certain it is that a sociologist—when he is sociologising—must *never* judge; and he is not likely to attain that position unless in daily life his charity greatly exceeds his righteousness. He must get altogether out of the habit of looking on men as sheep or goats: harsh condemnations must be abhorrent to him. And if a man shall ever arise who combines in his own person absolute truth with absolute charity, we venture to affirm that he will be able to read in the open pages of the 'Descriptive Sociology' the solution of all the puzzles and enigmas that cluster about the foundations of social life.

ART. VII.—THE CONFLICT OF COLOUR.

The Conflict of Colour. By B. L. PUTNAM WEALE. London : Macmillan and Co. 1910.

THE rapid succession of events in the East, the spread of education, the alteration of circumstances and conditions of life, the interchange of ideas between the East and the West, have introduced remarkable changes into the relations of Europe with Asia, and to some extent with parts of Africa. The earlier notions of political right, of the obligations of rulership in those regions, the points of view from which the history of early conquest or occupation is regarded, and the character of those who figured in it—all these things are passing into a new atmosphere of sentiment, and judged by a different moral standard. And we find, consequently, that in the sphere of Eastern politics the reckoning upon which European statesmen have hitherto shaped their course, framed their administrative measures, and made their calculations, is already falling so fast out of date that they are surprised by unexpected criticisms, and are confronted by difficulties for which they were unprepared.

This moral and national transformation is particularly affecting, more or less, all Asiatic countries, though in India, where its extension has been wider and speedier than elsewhere, the process and its results can be more closely surveyed. Our Indian empire was not finally rounded off and consolidated until the middle of the nineteenth century, when the annexation of the Punjab brought its frontiers up to the mountains beyond the Indus river. During the previous hundred years we had been expanding our supremacy after the old Imperial fashion, overthrowing unstable rulerships—none of them older than our own—annexing provinces, winning battles, reducing principalities to subordinate alliance. The people at large acquiesced, according to immemorial custom, in the substitution of stronger for weaker rulership; the power passed naturally into the hands of those who could take and use it. For a long period after the establishment of our incontestable predominance in the country we satisfied the native population, and justified our position, by giving them a system of government incomparably better than any that they had previously known. Foreign rule was to India no novelty; the subjection of miscellaneous races to one masterful sovereignty had been the ordinary conception of empire in Asia, as in ancient and even

medieval Europe, even up to the time when Dante wrote his 'De Monarchia' to prove that the Imperial overlordship, limited only by the ocean, was just and providentially ordained. It was the growth and formation of homogeneous nationalities that dissolved the fiction of universal empire in Western Europe; though in the south-east of our continent a jarring medley of discordant races, languages, and religions still frets under Austrian and Turkish jurisdiction, and in Russia the old type of absolute government still prevails. But it has been only within a few years that the ideas and aspirations of Nationalism have begun to percolate into Asia, where they are undermining the traditional despotism. They are perceptibly saturating the countries in South Asia which are under European dominion: the more rapidly because these happen to be in the possession of those western nations whose government at home is in form and spirit popular, if not democratic—England, France, and Holland; while their Asiatic dependencies are still under a system of modified autocracy. The general tendency of all these modern influences has been to stir up and sharpen latent differences of race and religion throughout Asia, and among the peoples under European rulership to give an increasing political significance to the primordial distinction of natural colour.

In 'The Conflict of Colour,' which is the title and the subject of the book which we propose to review, Mr. Putnam Weale presents to us a comprehensive survey of the situation and its consequences produced by the influx of the white races into Asiatic and African lands. His introductory chapter contains an historical retrospect of the causes and circumstances, political, colonial, and commercial, that have directed this overflow of the European nations during three centuries; and he observes that within this period they have not only acquired vast territories in two continents of the Old World, but have also established themselves throughout the whole of a third continent—America. He follows Captain Mahan in pointing to Sea Power as the mainspring of this prodigious outpouring from the West; he declares that ocean navigation altered the whole course of European history; he gives in outline a narrative of the contest among the States on the Atlantic seaboard for Asiatic markets and territory; he dilates upon the well-known observation that the loss of her American colonies turned the energies of England towards Asia. The subjoined passage indicates the main purport of his book:

'The American Revolution, more than any movement in history, revealed the Asiatic destiny of England, and by diverting those

endless streams of men from West to East has made the colour question a supreme one for England. The dazzling panorama of events which is unfolded in British-Asiatic history to-day makes men forget that rights were really acquired by the most primitive and unlawful method, and that hardly a conquest in the East but has been stained with deeds such as those with which the memory of the Caesars is reproached. The distance and variety of the continent of Asia, which endow it with such an infinite and inexhaustible charm, have in the past made the application of a sound public morality difficult; the task of raising the magnificent fabric of western sovereignty upon the dying embers of the gorgeous empires of the East has been pursued with no regard save for considerations similar to those which influenced Charlemagne a thousand years ago.'

We need not pause to criticise the accuracy of this very rhetorical preamble, wherein Caesar and Charlemagne march across the stage of history in order to enhance the dramatic effect. We may pass to a passage at the close of his introduction, indicating briefly the views and arguments which he desires to impress upon his readers:

'But now a new era is at length to hand. The old conditions have disappeared. Europe and Asia—and later Europe and Africa—must inevitably return to the relationship once existing between East and West. The equality between the two which formerly existed will surely be re-established—the relationship which has now existed for more than four centuries, and which owes its origin to the white man's sudden conquest of the ocean and his abandonment of land routes, must give place to something which, though it sounds very novel, is really a revival of something very old. By his conquest of the sea the white man gained wealth from far and wide and shook off his provincialism. Knowledge naturally followed; with knowledge came power, and this power led to his world-dominion.'

And the rest of his work is devoted to a forecast of the inevitable consequences of the position acquired by white rulers over immense alien multitudes; to painting the shadows that he believes to be falling over the magnificent fabric of western sovereignty in Asia, and especially to not untimely warnings of the need to tread warily the road that lies before England in India.

Mr. Putnam Weale has condensed his dissertation upon these many-sided and complicated questions into a volume of moderate size. It may be probably due to the necessity of compression that he occasionally builds up his main argument upon broad and very positive generalisations, at times disputable and excessive, to some of which there will probably be demur on the part of those who do not claim the gift of

prophecy regarding the distribution in future ages of mankind on the surface of the earth. The unceasing struggle for place and power, the swarming of the nations, the displacement of the weak by the strong, have prevailed from the most distant times, producing effects that were altogether incalculable beforehand: movements and vicissitudes that are not likely to cease while the human family continues to multiply, and the fight over land and its produce becomes keener. Yet our author assumes (for example) that 'the grand divisions and dwelling grounds of the races are now more or less settled for all time; that the era of vast migrations, and therefore of vast racial conflicts, has long since passed away, and that wars can never again lead to those strange displacements which twenty centuries ago were commonplaces.' He lays down 'the axiom that within certain limits the future of all races is now fixed. 'It is utterly inconceivable' (he says) that Europe should ever succumb to a black invasion, or America to a yellow race. Yet North America has changed from red to white (with a black streak across it) in less than three centuries; nor is it easy to foretell what colour will eventually prevail in South America. But we may admit that multitudinous changes of this kind have become exceedingly improbable; though any attempt to allocate the world's population as it may exist in far distant ages is as futile as would be a confident prediction of the geologic periods that may possibly supervene. Our present concern is with the signs and symptoms of restlessness among the coloured races of mankind; their impatience of European dominion; their attempts to mix with white folk in countries where labour is in demand, and where their entry is rigorously forbidden; while at the same time the European 'is still playing his old-world rôle of conqueror, and ruling over vast masses of the 'coloured population, virtually by force,' in extensive regions of Asia and Africa.

Mr. Putnam Weale surveys this situation with sombre misgivings. He sets before his readers a comparative table of the population of Europe and Asia respectively, from which, though such statistics can be little more than conjectural, he calculates that Asiatics already outnumber Europeans by two to one. He next subdivides the Asiatic countries into those which are subject and non-subject to European rulerships or protectorates; and from these he selects three, which he considers to have great military potentiality—China, Japan, and Turkey. By far the greatest number in the aggregate population of these countries belong to the yellow races in Eastern Asia; and here we are desired to observe that in

China and Japan these races are multiplying rapidly, while all the three States are taking active advantage of European lessons in the art of war. Our author proceeds to examine the political relations of Europe with these independent States. 'Only four European countries—Russia, Great Britain, France, and Holland—have to-day valuable stakes in Asia,' and of the 400,000,000 of Asiatics that are under their sway 'some 300,000,000 have Great Britain for their overlord.' Now according to the view taken in this book, England, by her treaties with Japan, indicated her belief that 'with the end of the nineteenth century the era of forcible expansion had come to an end,' while Russia was just then showing that her notions were very different. So the English statesmen resolved upon an alliance with Japan as an expedient for checking Russia's designs of territorial extension and conquest. In the result those designs were foiled; and moreover it has followed that the yellow races are expanding, their numbers are increasing, and they are spreading under economical pressure into the nearer parts of the Asiatic continent and of the islands in the southern seas. On the other hand, the white races, though in numbers immensely inferior, still hold and rule in Asia a much larger portion of its territory than the coloured races, and also are resolutely excluding the latter from intrusion into the Australasian and South African lands where Europeans are permanently settled, and which they reserve for themselves. Consequently, we are told, Eastern Asia, including India, is becoming overcrowded, for a teeming population is confined within comparatively narrow limits, and upon these data Mr. Putnam Weale places before us some remarkable conclusions:

'It may be said in general terms that the white man will never willingly retreat from the stand he has taken as world-conqueror; and as he cannot be forced just yet to retreat all along the line in Asia and Africa, seeing that he still possesses the world's great stocks of gold and the mastery of the ocean, war must constantly occur as the coloured races become stronger and stronger in offensive modern strength and attempt to win back piecemeal what they have lost in the past.'

Thus the leaders of this great uprising movement, which is to shake the white man's supremacy in Asia, and to reverse the economical forces that drove him into Eastern lands, will be China and Japan; and the Pacific Ocean is the open water-way by which they will break out. The collision, however, is not imminent, though it may be expedited by industrial

competition ; and the real cause is, we learn, to be found in the antipathy that has always existed between Europe and Asia. But at this stage of his argument Mr. Putnam Weale rather unexpectedly interposes the explanation that this antipathy, commonly supposed to be a matter of colour, is nothing of the sort, at any rate on the Asiatic side ; for

‘ though colour has become a barrier and also a great irritant, it is the white man who has largely taught the coloured man that it is so. It is because Europe’s standard has been so much higher than Asia’s standard during the past century or two, and her strength consequently so much greater, that Europe is still disliked and feared. This is nothing but the natural dislike of a weaker man for a stronger man, who has traded on his strength.’

He has become confident and overbearing ; his masterful ways are compelling the naturally pacific yellow races to accept his Gospel of Force, to adopt and turn against him his own methods and inventions. The twentieth century is to witness the organised effort of Asia to shake off the European incubus. Yet Mr. Putnam Weale insists emphatically that the Eastern climate, which enervates and depresses, puts the Asiatic at an insurmountable natural disadvantage ; and that it will be long before even Japan, with all her perseverance, sagacity, and imitative talent, will draw up to equality with the powerful civilisations of Europe.

Upon this question our author’s examination, at length, of Japan’s political situation, and of her relations, present and prospective, with China, is worth some attention as exhibiting his view of the consequences resulting from recent events and transactions. Japan has to reckon, he says, with the vicinity of three mighty nations, the Americans, the Russians, and the Chinese ; and in these conditions the problem for which Japan has to find a solution is thus stated. The essential aim and final purpose of her policy must be to bring the immense potential weight of China into the scale on her own side, in order to rectify the balance against her by uniting the yellow races in defensive opposition to the white races. But if the Chinese, with their immense superiority of territory, population, and wealth, develop a rapid and well-ordered advance toward a strong, centralised, and well-appointed State, organising their military resources and re-forming their government, the hegemony of Japan in the Far East will become seriously endangered. The evolution of China, however, must necessarily be slow ; for the empire is distracted internally by demands for constitutional reforms,

by financial difficulties that hinder effective military reorganisation, and by the recent establishment of Provincial Assemblies, which are obstacles to Imperial unification. And in the meantime the European Powers, whose offensive strength has hitherto been weakened by jealousies and suspicions of each other at home, may be wise enough to combine upon their manifest interest in counteracting projects for their commercial and political exclusion from Asia. Accordingly 'the whole 'outer problem for Japan is to hold the white Powers grouped 'against one another more or less as they stand at present, 'while cautiously she tightens her hold on China.'

Mr. Putnam Weale has no belief in the commonplace prediction that a yellow horde will some day sweep over Europe, or even that the cheap products of the Far East will eventually swamp the European markets. But he anticipates that a federation may be accomplished by the States in Eastern Asia which may be strong enough to shut out completely the white man and his commerce, and this he considers to be a real danger, for 'it will radically alter the entire economic 'relation throughout the world.' This can only be averted, he urges, by an agreement of the Western Powers on the policy of securing China's complete independence, and of making China ultimately stronger than Japan.

If these far-reaching predictions are likely to be realised, if the empires of the Far East are to form a coalition to exclude Europe and America from the shores of the Pacific, and to predominate by their military forces on that side of Asia, it follows, according to the writer's judgement, and indeed necessarily, that the recent policy of England in making treaties of alliance with Japan was an error. For the first treaty secured to the yellow kingdom a victory over Russia, which shook throughout Asia the belief that the European was irresistible in war. And the second treaty, in 1905, openly encouraged the Japanese to annex Korea, while it also actually brought their army into alliance with our own troops for the defence of India in the contingency of a Russian invasion. This is interpreted, with some reason, to amount to an admission that England mistrusts her power to protect her Indian Empire without the assistance of an Asiatic ally. Nor can it be denied that these measures might facilitate and favour any projects of Japan for assumption of leadership in the Far East.

With regard to this condemnation of the Anglo-Japanese treaties there is much to be considered on both sides of the questions involved. It is certain that the first treaty was a bold and effective interposition at a critical moment, directed

against the designs of Russia in the Far East, with the object of preserving the independence of China and Japan, and of protecting our important commercial interests in those regions. This sudden and opportune stroke hit the mark at which it was aimed, almost too effectually, for the triumph of Japan crippled Russia not only in the East but also in the West, where the balance of European power was disturbed to a degree that was not to the advantage of England. Yet the statesmen who made this treaty can plead that they were justified in looking to the immediate exigencies of the time. There were sundry and manifest reasons that justified them in thwarting Russia's advance to a position from which she would have become formidably dominant in Manchuria and Korea, would have threatened the independence of China, and would have isolated Japan. No one can now say what would have been the course of events if England had not stepped forward at that critical moment to prevent other Powers from aiding and abetting the Russian plans of aggrandisement in that part of Asia, to keep the ring in which the kingdoms of the Far West and the Far East were to contend by the ordeal of battle for superiority on the shores of the Pacific. It was by a coalition of three European States, from which England had held pointedly aloof, that Japan had been compelled in 1895 to give back to China the Liantung Peninsula and Port Arthur, which was soon afterwards occupied by Russia; when other strips of Chinese territory were annexed, as a sort of compensation, by Germany and England. Then ensued in 1900 the Boxer insurrection, instigated by the reactionary temper of the old Empress Dowager, which further weakened the Chinese Empire, so that the Chinese made no movement to stop Russia when she grasped at Korea. But the Russian bear had put his paw into a nest of wild bees. The extraordinary skill and foresight with which Japan calculated the chances of success and the difficulties of her antagonist, and selected the exact moment for striking at him, are in strong contrast with the no less astonishing blunders, diplomatic and military, of Russia, particularly with her false estimate of the enemy's strength, and of the strategical situation generally. The sound of those fierce battles on land and sea has reverberated across the world, it has startled Europe and awakened Asia; and for the first time in all history we may behold the portentous rise of an Asiatic Sea Power. Since then another treaty made by England with Japan has prolonged the alliance, and considerably enlarged its scope by the engagement for the defence of the Indian frontiers, which are exposed to no possible

enemy but Russia ; and Mr. Putnam Weale naturally denounces this treaty as a false step, a temporary expedient sure to involve us in confusion and embarrassment whenever the great conflict of colour, which he predicts, draws to a head in Asia. However this may be, the policy of England very soon took a turn in another direction, since in 1907 we arranged a Convention with Russia for the amicable settlement of Asiatic questions, and thereby reverted to a system of *rapprochement* between the two white empires in the East. We may welcome this agreement as a significant intimation that, after long diplomatic fencing and military manœuvring on either side, they have at last made the discovery that their true interests lie in a mutual understanding. For no remarkable perspicacity or foresight is needed to warn European rulers in Asia that it is full time for them to put aside minor international jealousies, and to fix their eyes steadily on the political horizon.

As matters now stand, the position of England in Asia is at least singular. Our Government has made an alliance with Japan for the preservation of China's independence and the protection of our commercial interests in the Far East, and has also signed a Convention with Russia which guarantees the integrity of Persia and non-interference with Afghanistan—the two kingdoms bordering on the western frontiers of India. Tibet is left outside the sphere of European influence or invasion ; and China has lost no time in abolishing the *régime* of the Lamas, and thus bringing the province under direct Imperial control. These engagements, taken together, may be interpreted as declaring the British policy to be the maintenance of the *status quo* throughout all the kingdoms of the Asiatic continent, for China and Japan will have rounded off their possessions by the absorption of Tibet and the annexation of Korea ; the era of conquest and aggression is to be closed.

When however Mr. Putnam Weale, in his third chapter, turns his attention to the Middle and Nearer East, he finds there problems very different from those which he has been discussing on the far side of Asia ; for it is in this region that the white man is already dominant or supremely influential. And he accordingly concentrates the discussion on the state of affairs in Egypt and India, where he finds that the conflict of colour is becoming serious. On this subject he discourses in somewhat unmeasured language, pointing to England's inconsistency in encouraging the ideals of Nationalism on the shores of the Pacific, while in the countries under her own government or control she is obliged to discountenance them. And he animadverts with vehemence upon the

'blind prejudices' that prevent the European from seeing things as they are, upon his refusal to entertain in the countries under his rule the very ideas which his presence there has inculcated, and his firm determination to hold tightly what his fathers have acquired. In obstinate prejudices of this kind he admits that the strength of a people resides; he defines them as judgements formed without examination; though a better explanation of this might be that they are hereditary, the ingrained tenacity of a nation that has fought, traded, and colonised in many distant countries, and is prepared to fulfil the duties of sovereignty but will accept no discussion of its rights.

But our author has convinced himself that these rights are about to be sharply disputed wherever European dominion, whether British, French, or Russian, exists in any form. He quotes John Stuart Mill for the axiom that 'such a thing as government by one people over another does not and cannot exist'; he asserts that foreign rule is no government at all, but only a system of provisional administration, and that the stirring of new ideas in the popular mind is producing a general conviction of this sort. India, he observes, is the real key to all Nearer Asia, just as Japan is the real key to all Further Asia; wherefore he proceeds to examine at some length the state of affairs in that country. One cardinal fact, which he says that Europeans find hardest to understand, is that the Asiatic cares little about justice, if he can get sympathy. When he is ruled by his own countrymen, they may punish him savagely, but at any rate they understand his frailties, and are in sympathy with his motives of action. Whereas the grand plea of the white man is that he dispenses justice wherever he rules, that his measures are accurately and scientifically framed, but 'this grand plea is looked upon as only stupid both by Asiatics and by those who really understand Asia.' In consequence the ears of the ruler are closed, and his eyes are shut, to the sounds and symptoms of agitation all round him; he commits mistakes in dull reliance on his own benevolent intentions and the rectitude and regularity of his administration, and on the material benefits which it confers on the people. He actually believes, we are told, that the longer he is known the better he will be liked by them; whereas in fact the effect of prolonged contact and intercourse may be quite otherwise. We may agree that sympathy, familiarity with the traditions, habits, and feelings of a society is not only more important than strict justice, but is an essential element of justice to others, in all the public and private relations of mankind; insomuch that there was no necessity to insist so emphatically, as is done in this book, upon

a truth that is perfectly well known to every intelligent administrator. Moreover, it would be a distinct mistake to suppose that the Asiatic does not set very considerable value upon the impartial and disinterested exercise of his governing power by the European; though his appreciation was much more strong in India in the days when the lawless and haphazard misrule of Moghuls, Marattas, and Afghans was still vivid in the recollection of an earlier generation. That the system of British administration is formal and unsympathetic is a necessary consequence of the strict obligation imposed upon British officials to conform their acts to the laws and regulations in force; but the benefits no less than the disadvantages are very well appreciated by the people.

It is not to be denied, as a general statement, that wherever the Asiatic is brought into association with a numerous and miscellaneous collection of Europeans, his dislike of them increases; the differences of manners, habits, of language and creed are sure to produce friction. For illustration of this unquestionable truism a long quotation is inserted from a book written by Mr. Meredith Townsend, who was the editor of a newspaper published within a few miles of Calcutta, and who left India, we believe, many years ago. He may be credited with an intimate personal knowledge of native feelings in Lower Bengal; but when he is described by Mr. Putnam Weale as one 'who certainly understood the Middle and Nearer East as 'few writers have done,' we must take leave to observe that such ample credentials would be difficult to verify. Mr. Townsend adduces the mutiny of the Sepoy army in 1857 as 'the broadest of all facts' supporting the conclusion that race antipathy is intensified by close intercourse. 'No class 'of natives,' he says, 'knew the European so well as the Sepoys 'knew their officers, and among no class was that knowledge 'in itself so irritating; when the men revolted, the officers 'with their families were slaughtered promiscuously.' But this argument will convince no one who is acquainted with the true history of that famous catastrophe. For nearly a century the Bengal Sepoys had been closely associated with their European officers, had served under them with fidelity, and proved their attachment incontestably; until a wild rumour that the British Government was attempting to destroy their caste by distributing greased cartridges drove ignorant and superstitious bands of armed men into sanguinary insurrection. An army in open mutiny, and all Oriental armies are prone to mutiny, will destroy its Government unless the outbreak is crushed; the mutineer knows well the penalty that awaits failure, nor is it

possible to assert that the revolt of the Janissaries against the Turkish Sultan, or of the Mamelukes against the Egyptian Khedive, or of the Sikh army against their chiefs after Ranjit Singh's death in 1839, can be attributed to race hatred. A mutiny among Asiatic soldiery invariably begins by the murder of officers.

Mr. Putnam Weale, however, admits that Mr. Townsend's explanation of the Sepoy rebellion is out of date, is inadequate, and unnecessarily pessimistic. He is on much firmer ground when he takes up again the main line of his argument, and declares that the recent developement of race antipathies in Asia is due everywhere to the persistent and unreasoning adherence of dominant Europeans to a position which is no longer tenable, to methods of government in which Asiatic communities formerly acquiesced because they knew no better, because these methods were in accordance with their own customs and traditions. He warns us that 'the 'changeless East is at last changing'; that a double movement, the growth of numbers and the growth of knowledge, is fostering new ideas, fresh needs and grievances, among subject populations; that the old order of things is passing away, and that a speedy readjustment of the relations between the white and the coloured races has become imperatively necessary. There is much truth in all this, and after the dismal exposure in his previous chapter of the blunders and crass stupidity of the Englishman in Asia, and of the perils by which he is encompassed, it is very inspiring to learn that the author can assure us that 'if we adjust matters as they should be adjusted, a 'change will magically come.' Upon an enumeration of the reforming programme laid out by Mr. G. K. Gokhale he makes the following commentary:

'A rapid perusal of these proposed reforms at once shows that the moderates in Indian politics do not yet aspire to anything more than a share in the administration of India—all that educated India now demands is to be given a real and practical share, no matter how small, in the administration, and then to put an end to the present system, under which the opinion of a foreign official overrides and completely extinguishes that of the educated men of India.'

And he adds that it is a matter of great surprise to discover, from the demands made in Mr. Gokhale's list for free elementary education to be made gradually compulsory, and for measures to relieve agricultural indebtedness, with improvements of the cultivator's material condition, that 'no attempt should have been made recently to improve the general lot of the people,

to educate them, to uplift them, to make them something better than mere helots, toiling under the heel of the usurer.' Yet a very cursory inquiry into the administrative history of India during the last fifty years would have shown him that the Government has for a long time paid active attention to the subject of education, and has passed special measures for dealing with the very difficult question of agricultural indebtedness, which is the plague of all early societies. And it is evident that the writer is quite unaware of the difficulties, the unpopularity of novelties among primitive folk, that hinder any rapid introduction of salutary reforms. On the other hand, it is admitted that the measures which, 'largely owing to the 'liberalism of Lord Morley,' have been recently passed, mark a substantial advance toward better things; and the writer has no doubt that these concessions will stimulate an independent demand for some decentralised system of representative government.

'It will one day be a question of practical politics whether the federation of all India under some pseudo-European form is to be worked out, or whether the granting of autonomy to the various provinces, which will make India assume something of the political appearance of South America—a South America united by a general concordat—is the more practical scheme.'

Such a change of institutions would obviously, as Mr. Putnam Weale points out, involve a corresponding change in the quality and training of the administrative agencies, in the *personnel* of those who are to be placed in charge of the new machinery. From this base he opens a fierce attack upon what he conceives to be the present system of selecting the future Indian official by the test of proficiency in classics.

'The hateful priggism which no open-minded man can doubt is inseparable from a too fervid study and worship of the literature and laws of Greece and Rome—with their rigid unbending formalism, their narrow traditions and all the illiberalism with which they are saturated—this priggism is no stuff with which to build a permanent empire. . . . The detachment and simplicity of mind with which the problems of Asia need to be approached can never be attained by those who have encased themselves in an unmeaning formalism suitable only for monasteries and monks.'

It is abundantly clear, from this passage, that the writer's own education has kept him free from the contamination of ancient literature, from any tincture of its spirit and intellectual influences; and, so far as this passage may be understood as an indictment of competitive examinations, we are not altogether

disposed to quarrel with it. In another passage, where he denounces the bureaucracy of India as the embodiment of alien rule in a form unfitted to the altering conditions and expectations of the people, and particularly incompatible with his plans for thorough-going constitutional reform, he has hit upon a point of considerable importance. For it may be agreed that the government of a great empire by the official hierarchy that is represented by a Civil Service, though it is an excellent instrument of efficient administration, provides little or no sufficient outlet for the reasonable ambition of that class whose talents, social rank, and general reputation mark them out in every country for prominence in the sphere of national politics. It is not in the nature or within the province of the most skilful and experienced functionaries to command popularity or to lead public opinion; and a policy of gradually extending the elective franchise and of creating legislative councils must depend more and more on independent support. The immediate difficulty is to discover, in a country that has known only autocratic rulership, those who possess or may develop, these rare qualifications: and we must be prepared for disappointments and failures. Yet we may trust that a people so intellectual as the Indians, so ready to grasp high ideals, may before long develop capacities that are everywhere essential to the permanent success of representative institutions.

In substance the charges upon which England is so roundly accused—we might say abused—in this book, amount to this, that in dealing with India and Egypt British politicians have been obtuse and dim-eyed—that they have stood still while the Asiatic world surrounding them is changing rapidly. Turning from the discussion of internal reforms to the wider subject of India's external relations, Mr Putnam Weale denounces British statesmen for clinging obstinately to the policy of seclusion, that is, 'of sedulously shutting off India from all contact by land 'and relying on the command of the sea for all intercourse.' No other explanation for this Chinese exclusiveness can be suggested by him than the inbred stupidity of the English race; though there is surely common sense in maintaining strong military frontiers. The future prosperity of the Indian people lies, we are told, in racial expansion, by sea and land; they are to be encouraged in migrating into the large half-populated countries on the West of India, especially into Persia, where there is little industry, and where wide tracts await the diligent cultivator. The underlying idea to be kept in view in promoting these migratory movements is not only to find a vent for the overcrowding of India, but also to increase the weight and

extend the range of Indian influence in Asiatic politics. For the grand problem toward which all our plans and projects should be directed is the settlement of some stable balance of Asiatic powers, the fixing of boundaries, the consolidation of Asiatic States in an equipoise entirely independent of European domination. This does not imply (as we understand) the disappearance of European Governments from Asia, but merely the complete separation of the political interests of the two continents, which are now confused by such incongruous ties as the Anglo-Japanese treaties. By this alliance England is opposed to Russia in the Far East, whereas in all other parts of the world her relations with Russia are friendly. And we are assured, in conclusion, that peace and order in Asia can only be secured by the combined action of the two great European Powers.

‘ Only two white races are supremely interested in Asia and what it stands for—the Anglo-Saxon and the Slav. Only these two races can solve the Asiatic problem. For though France has important stakes, the loss of those stakes would not mean to the world what a general Russian retreat or a general British retreat would mean. . . . Just as the only sound and enduring ideal in Eastern Asia is the creation of a reasonable balance of power between two Asiatic Powers—a balance which may never come about because of the false policy now to be pursued—so in Nearer and Middle Asia should something resembling the same counterpoise be aimed at, entirely independent of Europe.’

The place of Turkey in this comprehensive programme is not very precisely indicated ; but it obviously requires some careful adjustment ; since the Turks may find means of deranging the balance proposed. Turkey, we are told, is capable of founding a great Moslem empire that may be pushed forward to the vicinity of India, she may threaten India, and revive the Pan-Islamic idea. We are to understand, however, that the real centre of gravity of the Ottoman empire is no longer in Europe, but in Asia Minor, and that before many years pass the Turk must be ejected from Europe.

With regard to Egypt Mr. Putnam Weale finds the situation peculiarly complex. In India, England can try her administrative experiments securely, having a clear title, and knowing that this country is encompassed by the greatest mountain barrier in the world and by the sea, whereas ‘ Egypt has virtually no frontiers at all.’ Its people belong to the great communion of Islam ; and the country is open on three sides to incursions by restless Mohammedan tribes, whenever our hold on the Nile Valley, which is only provisional, becomes insecure. Here again we

are warned that we have made the radical error of ignoring native talent, and their increasing desire to manage their own internal affairs ; though ' whenever the British officials have had ' technical or straightforward work to do—ruler-like work fit ' for unimaginative men—they have done it in a manner ' deserving the highest praise.'

Finally, in order to complete his survey of the vast field upon which the ' Conflict of Colour ' has to be fought out, Mr. Putnam Weale discusses in his penultimate chapter ' The Black Problem.' He considers separately the internal problem of the future of the black race in countries where, as in America, it is under the control of the white man, and the external problem, which affects North Africa ; and under both divisions of the subject he foresees danger and grave embarrassment from the fact that the black races multiply everywhere much faster than the races of any other colour. But we may observe, with regard to this question in America, that Mr. A. H. Stone, in his ' Studies in the American ' Race Problem,' concludes, after careful investigation, that the black population is increasing more slowly than the white ; and that the negro is steadily losing ground. In Africa, on the other hand, where the climate is against the European and favourable only to the native, whenever peace, prosperity, and the prevention of epidemics shall have removed the restraints upon multiplication, the negro may be expected to breed more rapidly than ever ; and it is suggested in this book that the propagation of Islam may eventually bring the black and brown races into line against the white foreigner. But we cannot follow our author into inexhaustible speculations upon the probable future of the African races.

In the foregoing pages we have endeavoured to summarise the views and arguments of a writer who has undertaken a panoramic survey of the present state and prospective destinies of the three main sections into which mankind has been distributed geographically, and marked out by the distinction of colour. His theories are often extravagant ; his knowledge of facts is occasionally imperfect, and some of his inferences from them decidedly questionable ; his trenchant criticisms and invectives are too positive and indiscriminate. His language is too exuberant for grave judgements on high issues ; he is at times vexed by the hyperbolic fiend whom Malvolio was adjured to cast out *—one might fancy that his subject had over-coloured his style. He lays bare too unmercifully the follies and frailties that he places to the account of European domination over

* Twelfth Night, Act iv.

Asia and Africa in the past ; his prophetic vision casts, we think, too dark a shadow over coming events. And he is mistaken in assuming, as would appear from the book, that he has been the first to reveal to the English nation the risks and perplexities that beset their position in the East. These things have been long discerned by far-sighted administrators, who have not thought it their business to proclaim to the world all that they knew or foresaw. Yet it must be admitted that his bold generalisations throw a broad though uncertain light over the whole situation, that his censures are not always undeserved, and that his warnings are often salutary. He has hit some salient points in the national character ; he sees, as others have done before him, that a proud and energetic race, somewhat rough in manner and disdainful of ceremonial, cannot mix freely with the fastidious and formal Asiatic without exciting antipathies and incurring dislike. That these feelings prevail widely among Indians is natural, and the fact has been always apparent to those Englishmen whose observation has not been superficial during many years of residence in the country. Among certain classes the irreconcilable prejudice of discordant races has undoubtedly stimulated a growing impatience of foreign rule. But when our author asserts that the general population regards European dominion with a growing aversion, his own preconceptions carry him too fast and too far, for personal repugnance to the white man and his very uncongenial habits is not incompatible with a clear appreciation by the masses of the benefits conferred by his government. The Abbé Dubois, who lived for many years as a missionary in South India during the earlier part of the nineteenth century, and who had intimate knowledge of the people, wrote thus of the British Government :

‘ It is a piece of huge complicated machinery moved by springs which have been arbitrarily adapted to it. Under the supremacy of the Brahmins the people of India disliked their government, while they cherished and respected their rulers. Under the supremacy of Europeans they dislike their rulers, while they cherish and respect their government. . . . Nevertheless, the justice and prudence which the present rulers display in endeavouring to make this people less unhappy than they have been hitherto : the anxiety they manifest to increase their material comfort ; above all, the inviolable respect which they constantly show for the customs and religious beliefs of the country, the protection they afford to the weak as well as to the strong . . . all these have contributed more to the consolidation of their power than even their victories and conquests.’

This is the judgement formed nearly a century ago by an impartial and thoroughly competent French authority ; and

we believe that it holds good for application to the present state of public opinion throughout the greater part of our Indian Empire, particularly in those provinces where the recollections of arbitrary misrule, fiscal extortion, and perpetual insecurity of life and property have not faded away. For certain sections of the population, it may be true, that the longer they have lived under European dominion the more they have become disaffected to it; but this is partly because the evils which it swept away are so utterly forgotten that its advantages are regarded by the present generation as the aboriginal rights of man.

The Englishman, on his side, has been prone to excessive reliance on the material benefits which he has conferred upon India; he treats them as reasonably justifying his supremacy; he is confident that they secure to it a fair working popularity. According to Mr. Putnam Weale, he has strictly confined himself, 'because of the timidity of his imagination, to plain 'straightforward administrative work which, politically, 'means marking time and nothing more.' Yet, by a very moderate estimate, it means considerably more, at any rate in the opinion (above cited) of the Abbé Dubois. Again, we are assured that 'the grand plea' of the white man—that he is just, that he dispenses absolute justice wherever he rules, that he attends to all measures with scientific accuracy—is looked upon as only stupid both by Asiatics and by those who really understand Asia—since the European is simply disliked because he is a European. Mutual antipathies between tribes, nations, and races have always been deep-seated and disintegrating forces; they are sharply accentuated by colour; it would be a delusion to suppose that they can be eradicated by judicious administration. Yet, after all, the Asiatic does set material value upon a just, honest, and humane government—to the extent, at least, that when he has become accustomed to the comforts of this system, he is very reluctant to part with them; and in India the majority still associate them with the British rule, and with no other. Nevertheless the Englishman in India has to take full account of the effervescence of new ideas, which are always far stronger than institutions; and his best insurance against the uncertainties of the future will be found in taking the highest native talent and capacity into partnership, in enlarging the Indian share of Imperial duties and responsibilities.

We can perceive that the new leaven of imported European civilisation is fermenting throughout independent Asia; it has worked the greatest changes at the two extremities of that

Continent—in Japan and, latterly, in that Ottoman Empire which has hitherto been supposed to be dying by inches. Of Japan enough has been already said in this article. But in Turkey we have before our eyes the instructive example of the methods and expedients to which the Asiatic constitutionalist is driven when he finds himself confronted by the actualities of the situation that he has created. He has accomplished a successful revolution by proclaiming liberal reform, enlightened administration, and equality of civic rights. His first acts are to establish a military dictatorship, and to organise a very effective army under its direct command. He sends the deputies elected to the new Chambers on a tour round Europe, they fraternise with British members of Parliament in London. But at home the Government finds it necessary to suppress relentlessly a revolt of the Albanians against their treatment by its agents, to slaughter the Christian Armenians who have taken civic equality too seriously, and to despatch an army for bringing the Arab tribes under control. The Ottoman empire, like the British empire of India, includes a medley of discordant races, intersected by two antagonistic creeds, with the inestimable advantage, on the side of the Turks, that the Sovereign professes the creed to which an overwhelming majority of his subjects belong. Yet the state of constitutionalism in Turkey may convey to ardent Indian reformers some foretaste of what might follow in India, if the next step, as is suggested in this book, is to introduce into that country 'some bona-fide decentralised system of representative government,' whether by the federation of all India, or by creating autonomous provinces. All the elements of discord will break out; education and the debating faculty will go down before physical strength and energy; and the British suzerain will be compelled to interfere for the suppression of internal strife and dissensions.

'The plain fact being that the Turk is the most militant of Asiatics, the fate of his race depends not so much on the spread of constitutionalism, which is a pure exotic, as on the regeneration of his militarism,' is a remark with which those who best understand his situation will agree; and it has, moreover, a certain bearing upon the difficulties that may await all the governments that are contemplating the erection of the constitutional façade in Asia, before the materials for a substantial fabric are on the ground. In one of Lord Acton's essays on 'The History of Freedom' he has written of a period of European confusion that 'to rear a new civilisation and blend hostile and unequal races into a nation, the thing wanted

'was not Liberty, but Force,'—and the permanent civilisation of all Asia depends on the practical recognition of this indubitable truth. The foundation required for a stable parliamentary system is national unity; for when the population is heterogeneous, representative institutions are apt to arouse and give voice to local and provincial jealousies, as may be seen even in the case of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Nor is Federation likely to prosper without some kind of uniformity at its base. We do not question the good intention or the earnest patriotism of those leaders of Indian public opinion, in Bengal and elsewhere, who are pressing the demand for large constitutional reforms. They have a claim on our sympathy, and, so far as may be prudent, on our support. Their own interest lies in moderation, lest some hazardous experiment, of the kind suggested as 'the next step' in this book, should collapse into general confusion. And in that case the sincere Indian patriot might be left reflecting on the saying of a Frenchman who had witnessed the consequences in his own country of precipitation in politics, that '*En révolution les honnêtes gens sont toujours balayés.*' It is morally certain that, whatever changes may be made in the form of Asiatic governments, the strongest men in a country—those who act roughly and resolutely—will still be uppermost.

There can be no longer any doubt that an unquiet spirit has taken possession of all Asia; quickening a reaction against the somewhat complacent belief in his own strength and intellectual superiority of the European, who has found that his lessons in the rudiments of civilisation have produced results that until quite recently he had not foreseen. We can understand how it came to pass that Russia unconsciously touched the electric wire that vibrated across the whole Eastern Continent. The path of conquest which that empire had been laboriously clearing for nearly two centuries from the Caucasus to the Pacific lay entirely through deserts and mountains inhabited by rude tribes, interspersed here and there by such barbarous principalities as Khiva and Bokhara. Mongolia interposes no obstacles; she treads heavily on the skirts of Chinese Turkestan, and forces her way into Manchuria by overawing the Chinese Government. At the end of this easy journey through wild tracts and weak hordes, Russia is suddenly confronted by the strongest and most civilised State in Asia, her equal in strategy and diplomacy, resolutely prepared to bar her onward march. Russia's military base is far distant; Japan is within striking distance of her adversary, but the European has become habituated to facile triumphs over

Asiatics, he runs into disaster through total miscalculation of the odds against him and contempt of his enemy. The shock reverberates from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean; the European Powers suspend any projects they may have been meditating for rounding off their possessions in Asia; Russia and England agree formally to keep their hands off Persia, Afghanistan, and Tibet; the latest Anglo-Japanese treaty recognises the independence and integrity of the Chinese Empire. The apparent outcome of all these diplomatic arrangements would appear to be that, after the rapid expansion of European dominion in Asia and Africa during the nineteenth century, the twentieth century opens with a policy of non-aggression and the preservation of the *status quo*.

If these self-denying ordinances framed by the two great Asiatic Powers are to hold good and to last, the effect may be to settle down the States of Asia within demarcated frontiers, and to interdict territorial encroachments. The frontiers of the old Asiatic monarchies were never delimited; they shifted according to the military strength or weakness of the dynasties; just as the Asiatic religions have no definite creeds or formal circumscribing articles, but rise, fall, and vary according to the force of spiritual ideas. All the territorial frontiers that have been laid down in Asia were fixed under European pressure and supervision; and to give practical effect to the new policy it will probably be necessary to complete the demarcation throughout. On such a basis it is not impossible that Mr. Putnam Weale's theory of the pacification of Asia by the gradual establishment of a balance of power might have some chance of success; though how the equipoise is to be maintained and exist, entirely independent of European domination, requires more explanation than is given in his book. Upon this question his views, so far as we can connect them, appear to contemplate the gradual introduction of autonomy into every Asiatic country, whether independent or dependent, so that the various-coloured peoples and races may be left to manage their own affairs, to work out their own salvation without that incessant interference by the white man, whose blunders and domineering ways have produced irritation and are said to be rapidly bringing to a climax the conflict of colour. And the settlement of Asia on these principles is expected to promote the stability of European equipoise; the ancient world is to be brought in to redress the balance of the modern States, who will no longer be jostling each other and disputing over annexations or spheres of interest in the East. But this programme further demands that India of her

own strength shall be made to balance against the chaotic world lying beyond her frontiers and reaching to Egypt and Turkey, as well as against any European menace. No one can deny, we are assured by Mr. Putnam Weale, that this policy is logical, sound, and in the highest degree expedient; though we must presume that it is prescribed as an ulterior and comparatively distant object to be attained. For in existing circumstances it would evidently upset all the existing diplomatic arrangements, would provoke fresh racial discontents in Asia, and would embroil half the governments of Europe in violent quarrels. But the projection on paper of the world's future map is a task of considerable magnitude, and our author's scheme for planning it out cannot be reckoned the most important part of his book.

In the final chapter we have a retrospective sketch of the historical conflict between East and West, which purports to summarise the general conclusions of this book, though they are not always relevant to our author's particular theme. There is some novelty in the argument that the effects of this long conflict have been invariably to Europe's advantage. It is maintained here that by successive devastating invasions Asia shook and hastened Europe into new life, that the modern nations were thus hammered out and forged on the Asiatic anvil; that the tremendous efforts needed to repulse and eject the Huns, Arabs, Mongols, and Turks bred in the white races their qualities of endurance, fierce energy, and daring enterprise. Fortified by this training the European in the sixteenth century turned upon the Asiatic; he had been driven out of Asia after the fall of the Byzantine Empire, he could not make a counter-attack by land; but just at this time the ocean routes, eastward and westward, were explored; and the nations on the Atlantic littoral invaded India, and coasted round Further Asia. The story of the rise of European dominion in the East has often been told; but the point which Mr. Putnam Weale hammers into the thickheaded Englishman is that his tenure of it was never more than transitory, that his scientific inventions, his administrative monopoly, are being used to upset him; and that those who believe in the permanency of the system on which he relies are living in a fool's paradise. There is but one policy, he asserts vehemently, that will appease spreading discontent, satisfy our fellow-subjects, and indeed preserve the whole British Empire from the danger of Asiatic secession. For he bids us remember that 'if there is one Power whose whole future is bound up with Orientalism, that Power is England.' We must expedite the devolution of autonomy; we must organise

India as a self-governing State, equipped for her own defence and support ; neither dependent upon Great Britain nor upon Japanese treaties for protection, nor subordinate to the economical and commercial interests of the West ; we have to lay upon India and the Indian people the duty of providing for their own welfare in their own way ; and to raise them, step by step, to the rank and responsibilities of free partnership in the fortunes of the British Empire. It is an attractive prospectus, taking small account of risks, obstacles, prejudices, and our own supposed incapacities ; for we are simultaneously assured that 'Englishmen were never politically blinder than to-day, never 'more sunk in localism, never more absorbed in the trivialities 'of the hour,' particularly the specialists on Asiatic problems. But Mr. Putnam Weale's high-flying genius ignores the doubts and difficulties of pedestrian politics. And the final sentence of this book sounds like a prophecy of the Asiatic Sibyl : 'It is 'at last quite certain that the question of colour is the rock 'upon which the Empire must split, or on which may be 'buiilded the greatest edifice the world has ever seen.'

The modern facility of communication between distant parts of the earth, the closer and more frequent intercourse and intermixture among human groups that were formerly isolated and remote, have drawn special attention in recent years to ethnological problems. Some writers have treated a race as a distinct species with ineradicable characteristics or qualities that persist more or less under all conditions of existence. The Comte de Gobineau devoted his '*Essai sur l'inégalité des 'races humaines*' to prove the unique importance of race-purity, and the degeneration that follows the crossing of the higher with the lower breeds. Upon this theory he explains the whole course of history, the rise and decadence of nations, the general degradation of mankind to a common level of deplorable mediocrity by the obliteration of the original types. More recently Mr. H. Chamberlain has expounded an opposite view, he has chanted the glories of the Teutonic nations, their exclusive supremacy in thought and action ; maintaining that all the grand figures in history have had an infusion of the Teutonic strain, and that even the founders of the great world-religions, though they have all been Asiatics, are more or less related by blood to this natural nobility. The scientific demonstration of the perpetual struggle for existence among plants and animals has been extended to the human family, has to some degree hardened the popular conscience, and has affected political ethics. John Stuart Mill, on the other hand, held that it was a pestilent error to regard distinctions of race

as innate and in the main indelible ; at any rate, he preferred to leave free competition to determine whether such distinctions were radical or merely the result of external circumstance ; he relied principally upon education and culture for improving the lot of mankind. Mr. Putnam Weale's position is that racial sentiment and the claims to racial equality do exercise a most powerful influence over the direction and tendencies of contemporary politics ; yet he does not deny that climate may impose upon certain races an irremovable disadvantage. He quotes, not without well-merited admiration, the late Charles Pearson's book on ' National Life and Character,' the work of an original thinker who was perhaps the first to shake the sanguine faith of the white man in his mission to control and civilise, to his own profit, the coloured world. Pearson indeed anticipated Mr. Putnam Weale in showing how the abnormal multiplication of Asiatic populations under European rule, and the development of their faculties under our tutelage, threatened to turn the scale against the white man, so that he might be eventually overmatched and driven out by his own weapons. But Pearson also predicted that the higher races were destined to lose energy, to decay in character, and to be reduced to the lower ranks of the world's army ; and these melancholy conclusions are rejected by the ' Conflict of Colour.' They are tinged, its author declares, with ' the false and decadent intellectualism ' that is infecting the minds of British statesmen, who are becoming quite capable, unless they open their eyes and alter their course, of fulfilling the gloomy predictions of the pessimist. Yet after all Mr. Putnam Weale is by comparison an optimist ; there is still a chance of saving the British Empire in Asia if we listen to his warnings and lose no time in acting upon his counsels. He denounces ignorance and stupidity much too freely ; his alarm bell clangs rather too loudly ; for the British statesman is by no means so deaf to the sounds and stirring of Eastern nations as he supposes. But he has a keen eye for our national defects ; he can tell us many things that are unpleasantly true ; he can startle us into salutary doubts and grave misgivings. The average Englishman cherishes the belief that economical improvements, public instruction, good laws, and regular administration will obliterate antipathies, extirpate irrational prejudices, and reconcile Asiatic folk to the blessings of an alien civilisation. Mr. Putnam Weale pronounces this to be a dangerous illusion ; and though he presses this point too absolutely, it is by no means certain that he is very far wrong.

ART. VIII.—THE BARBARY CORSAIRS.

1. *Sea-Wolves of the Mediterranean: the Grand Period of the Moslem Corsairs.* By COMMANDER E. HAMILTON CURREY, R.N. London: John Murray. 1910.
2. *Charles Philip Yorke, Fourth Earl of Hardwicke, Vice-Admiral, R.N. A Memoir.* By THE LADY BIDDULPH OF LEDBURY. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1910.

AMONG all the industries that have ever flourished in the Mediterranean none has displayed a greater vitality or enjoyed a wider popularity than the industry of the pirate. In Homeric society the sea-robber is a person honoured in proportion to the magnitude of his robberies. No stigma attaches to his nefarious profession: so that, when a stranger lands at a port, the host, in asking him what the purpose of his voyage may be, does not hesitate to suggest maritime plunder as one of the objects which might, as a matter of course, engage his guest's attention. Twice in the 'Odyssey' we have this illuminating question put to newcomers in perfect good faith. The extension of sea-traffic and the growth of civilisation in subsequent ages did not alter this state of things to any appreciable degree. Robbery at sea survived the partial suppression of brigandage on land, and, through all the vicissitudes which that part of the world has experienced during the last three thousand years, piracy seems to have maintained its place as one of the most profitable and honourable pursuits. Maritime powers—Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Saracen, Venetian—arose age after age to police the highways and to purge the byways of the Mediterranean. But, after a longer or shorter sway, they all disappeared, each in its turn compelled to surrender the freedom of the sea to the rule of the corsair.

It would, however, be hard to find, in all the records of Mediterranean lawlessness, a period during which the pirate pursued his picturesque and pernicious avocation with greater impunity, or conducted his operations on a more magnificent scale than the period inaugurated by the appearance of the Turkish flag upon the waters of the Levant. One of the consequences of that event was to turn the sea-rover's desultory depredations into a permanent domination. Piracy, as might have been expected, was fostered, in the first instance, by the fierce struggle for maritime supremacy which the sultan waged

with his Frank rivals. Both Christians and Mohammedans, firmly convinced that they fought for their respective gods, allowed no scruple to stand in the way of their divine mission. Religious zeal sanctified national rapacity, and the sins prompted by private greed were easily mistaken for services inspired by a sense of public duty. From the beginning of the fifteenth century the Mediterranean swarmed with corsairs of both creeds. Wherever the convenience of safe anchorage attracted the merchant and the mariner, there also the hope of booty induced the marauder to lie in wait. Every headland, creek, and channel on the way to a commercial port, from the Straits of Gibraltar to those of the Dardanelles, was infested by pirate ships, and even the best protected harbours were not always proof against their daring inroads. Everywhere the traveller might suddenly find himself caught, stripped of his very clothes, and carried off to captivity. The land was as much exposed to danger as the sea. Corsairs of all nationalities might be found everywhere ravaging the coasts and the islands and sweeping off thousands of hapless victims into the noisome holds of their galleys. On such a scale were these raids conducted that the Ægean rapidly reverted to the prehistoric condition described by Thucydides. The inhabitants were forced to quit the vicinity of the sea and to build their towns far inland, abandoning the best harbours to the pirate crews.

The reign of terror thus established continued after the struggle had been decided in favour of the Turk. Indeed, the progress of piracy kept pace with the progress of Turkish naval power and reached its apogee when the sultan attained the object of his ambition. It was natural that it should be so, for that triumph was itself the work of pirates. From the very first the Turk, conscious of his inevitable inaptitude for the life of the sea, had depended for the prosecution of his naval enterprises on the maritime populations which he had subjugated. The Ottoman fleets were built, manned, and maintained very largely by the inhabitants of the Greek islands and seaports of the Ægean. To the skill of those subjects the sultan was indebted for his victories at sea, and to their financial contributions for the facility with which he recovered from his defeats. Those subjects, however, could only be trusted to serve. For the command of his ships the sultan wanted men who with the necessary ability combined the equally necessary qualification of fidelity. Such men he found among the Mohammedan corsairs—most of them of Christian origin—who thrived on the shores of the Levant.

These men formed an admirable reserve of maritime strength. In the course of the preceding centuries piracy had become an hereditary pursuit with them and the habit of navigation a second nature. They were an amphibious class of people, as much at home in a cabin afloat as in a cottage ashore. The initiation in the ways of the winds and the waves, which they received from their fathers in childhood, developed into an instinct which impelled them to take to the sea from an early age. They would begin by enlisting under some corsair of established reputation and, having served their apprenticeship with him, a number of them would form a company to equip a small vessel on their own account, sharing the labour and the lucre of their voyages. If fortune proved kind, each of these rogues might in time rise to the ownership of a galley which he was eager to employ for the advancement of the Faith and his own enrichment. In this manner there was cemented between the Mohammedan pirates of the Mediterranean and the Sublime Porte a connexion productive of mutual benefit. The pirates supplied the ships and the sailors, the Porte the soldiers, and the partners divided the spoil between them. Now and then superior ability and luck would conspire to lift one of these obscure freebooters to the highest rank in the Ottoman navy. Among such fortunate adventurers were the brothers Barbarossa whose rise to eminence in the sixteenth century resulted in the foundation of the great corsair commonwealth upon the Barbary coast.

It is the extraordinary career of these ruffians of genius that Commander Currey undertakes to narrate in a work which makes no pretence to original research or to critical acumen. The author is content to draw his material at second or third hand from printed books more or less accessible to every student, and he naïvely repeats the venerable errors for which some of those books are responsible. He persists in believing, for example, that the appellation 'Barbarossa' was an epithet descriptive of the colour of his heroes' beards. As a matter of prosaic fact, it was only a Western mispronunciation of 'Baba-Uruj,' the name of the elder of the two brothers which, by an intelligible confusion, was extended to the younger and more famous Khair-ed-din. In like manner, he is credulous enough to introduce into his story long set speeches which bear on the face of them eloquent evidence of their utter lack of authenticity. Nevertheless, the work, despite its numerous blunders of statement and judgement, deserves reading as a vigorous and vivid, if somewhat verbose, account of a most remarkable historical episode; for, while frankly ignoring the

political significance of his subject, the writer does ample justice to its romantic and personal aspect. Within a compass not exceeding that of an ordinary novel and covering a period of over eighty years (1492–1580) he tells us how the bold sons of an Albanian renegade and of a Greek woman of Mytilene, having begun life as common sea-robbers, became the fathers of Ottoman sea-power and the founders of states destined for three centuries to distress and dishonour all the sea-faring nations of Christendom. And he tells all this with an abundance of graphic detail, an imaginative insight into the manners and motives of the people concerned, and a grasp of geographical and technical conditions calculated to delight the reader who is usually repelled by more ambitious essays.

The Barbarossas—to give them their traditional misnomer—found the field prepared for them. The African littoral at the moment of their appearance was fringed with Mohammedan principalities—the effete remnants of the mighty Saracen Empire—at perpetual enmity with each other, and internally rent by savage dynastic feuds. The emirs who misruled these territories had long been in the habit of supplementing the revenues which they wrung from their subjects by throwing their harbours open to the marauders of the Mediterranean and by sharing the fruits of their depredations.

The Barbarossas were at first glad enough to purchase the favour of the decadent princes of Algiers and Tunis by paying to them the customary proportion of the profits they realised from the sale of their booty. But chance gradually enabled them to widen the scope of their ambition, to supplant the potentates they once subsidised, and ultimately to add the African states to the Ottoman Empire. Under the able management of Khair-ed-din, Algiers and Tunis became the principal strongholds of Mohammedan piracy in the Mediterranean and the sultan's fleet the dominant factor in that sea. Henceforth these cities from mere hiding places of malefactors, who simply sought shelter in their harbours, and markets for stolen goods on their shores, became compact, strongly fortified, and well organised kingdoms admirably provided for all purposes of offence and defence. Their galleys summer after summer sailed forth in search of plunder, and then returned home towing behind them the Christian vessels which they captured on the open sea, and carrying, huddled in the lower decks, hundreds of miserable prisoners whom they swept off the coasts of Italy, Sicily, France, and Spain.

The sultan's maritime supremacy came to an end in the battle of Lepanto (1571); but that catastrophe did not affect

the position of Algiers, Tunis, and their competitor Tripoli. On the contrary, if the Turk's naval victories were responsible for the foundation of those citadels of iniquity, his failures were not less responsible for the perpetuation of their activity. The sultan on losing the command of the sea lost all practical control over his African possessions. The authority of his pashas was soon usurped by the Deys whom the local garrisons elected and deposed at will, and the annual dispatch of gifts to Constantinople remained the sole token of allegiance. At the same time, the sultan became more and more dependent upon the voluntary assistance of the Algerine, Tunisian, and Tripoline pirates in his wars with the maritime nations of Europe, and he was therefore obliged not only to connive at the outrages committed by his nominal subjects upon his friends, but even to shield them, to the best of his ability, from the chastisement which they deserved. Encouraged by impunity, the Barbary corsairs grew daily in audacity and turpitude. The ships they captured added to their strength, the cargoes of those ships to their wealth, and the crews to their numbers. For the cruel treatment to which the captives were subjected tempted many of them to embrace Islam and thus to become the confederates of their captors. Nor was this the only means by which the ranks of the miscreants were swelled. The fame of their exploits and the hope of easy enrichment drew to the Barbary coast numbers of adventurers from all parts of Europe. As Cilicia in Roman times, so Africa from the sixteenth century onwards was the rallying ground for lawless elements from far and near. The various wars between England, Spain, France, and Holland, which make up so much of the contemporary history of Europe, brought into being numbers of men accustomed to look upon the spoliation of the enemy's merchant ships as a legitimate occupation. Many of these men who, while hostilities lasted, carried on their lucrative operations for the good of their country, on the conclusion of peace liked to continue them for their own. Further, the European fleets, both royal and mercantile, always contained a fair proportion of discontented mariners who were only too ready, when the opportunity offered, to embrace the corsair's calling. Lastly, in every European country were in those days to be found young men representing all social ranks who were tempted to lawlessness by sheer restlessness of temper and love of adventure. All these elements sought and found in the Barbary states a field for the exercise of their talents, the gratification of their passions, and the disposal of their ill-gotten gains.

We have, for instance, in the first decade of the seventeenth century three eminent examples of Europeans who succeeded in making themselves terrible as Barbary corsairs. The English sailor Ward and his Dutch contemporary Dansker were both deserters from the navies of their respective countries, and they were both induced to join the Tunis sea-rovers by the same motives which induce common criminals to join gangs of kindred spirits the world over. But in sharp contrast to them stand men of a totally different type—men like Sir Francis Verney, the heir of a good Buckinghamshire family: a young gentleman favoured by nature with looks and brains, by fortune with wealth, and by the University of Oxford with the advantages of a liberal education. At the age of twenty Verney had received the honour of Knighthood. Three years later he was obliged to sell his estates. Finding life at home difficult and tedious, he went abroad, squandered his money, fought duels, and generally led the life of a thoroughbred libertine. At last he decided to repair his fortunes and to continue the adventurous life he loved by turning pirate. Early in 1609 he betook himself to Algiers where he distinguished himself by the pitiless persecution of his own countrymen. All that these Christian free lances had to do in order to be admitted to the full privileges offered by the pirate states was to renounce their religion—‘to turn Turks’ as the phrase went—and to rival their Mohammedan colleagues in cruelty. For though the Algerine, Tunisian, and Tripoline corsairs were frequently joined by ‘voluntaries’ who, having no intention to stay permanently with them, retained their faith, the majority of European recruits were renegades; and these from an early date displayed in a high degree all the vices characteristic of the countries of their adoption, accentuated by the apostate’s rancour.

Thus constantly reinforced and stimulated from without, the Barbary states were able to keep abreast of the greatest maritime nations of Europe. Their very existence depended upon their efficiency at sea, and on the science of naval warfare they concentrated all their energies. Early in the seventeenth century the pirates of Algiers, following the example of England and Holland, began to exchange their small galleots for square-rigged vessels not inferior in size, strength, and speed to those of the best navies of the period, and by 1616 their fleet consisted of forty tall ships of between 200 and 400 tons each. With that fleet they scoured both the Mediterranean and the Atlantic, working untold mischief upon the mercantile marines of Christendom. Less extensive, but in its degree

not less destructive, was the activity of the Tunis and Tripoli cruisers. At sight of their prey they would swoop upon it with streamers ostentatiously flying and top-sails spread to the wind. The bigger merchant vessels, which carried a large number of guns, when the odds were not too many, succeeded in holding their own, occasionally even in capturing the would-be captor. The crews of the lesser ships also frequently made a gallant bid for freedom, using their ordnance to some purpose, and, when boarded, fighting fiercely hand to hand with the pirates; often not yielding until after their own ship had been set on fire round them. But the clumsy barques of less than fifty tons, being no match for the swift-sailing and well-armed galleys of the freebooters, at the approach of the 'Turk' had no alternative but a choice between various forms of disaster: the crews were forced either to run the barque ashore and take refuge on land, leaving their vessel to take care of itself, or to quit their craft in the open sea and try to save themselves in their boats, or lastly to strike their sails and tamely surrender their property and their liberty in order to preserve their lives. Contemporary records teem with incidents illustrating all these varieties of misfortune as well as with many feats of heroic despair, resourceful stratagems, narrow escapes, and glorious acts of retribution.

In vain were all the expostulations of the European Ambassadors at Constantinople and all the negotiations carried on by the European merchants directly with the governments of Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli. Neither the sultan nor his viceroys ever refused to sign a treaty; none of them ever dreamed of observing its stipulations, for they looked upon a frequent renewal of international agreements only as a source of bakshish. It was not long before the Barbary cruisers carried their depredations as far as the English and Irish Channels, dragging men and women off to Africa even from our coasts. By 1617 it was estimated that England and Scotland alone had been robbed of no fewer than 300 vessels with their crews and cargoes,* and the number of prisoners went on increasing year after year. The condition of these wretches supplies a subject of lamentation in innumerable documents, public and private, of the seventeenth century; and it is easy, by piecing together the details which they contain, to form a tolerably clear idea of what that condition meant to the sufferers.

* Hist. MSS. Comm. VIII. R. p. 238; IX. R. part I. p. 265.

On reaching their destination the captives were first shown to the Dey, who picked for himself the share sanctioned by custom—one out of every eight. These were employed in the arsenal, in the construction of public works and other state labour. The rest belonged to their captors, and being duly appraised by them were driven to the market in charge of specially appointed officers who quickened the pace of the reluctant with sticks and goads. Once in the market they were hawked about, examined, and bargained over like cattle or horses. Skilled artisans, gunners, and pilots naturally fetched the highest prices, but there is on record the sale of an English sea-captain, one of whose hands was disabled, for £7 10s. Of those who had nothing but muscles to recommend them, some were sold up country, others were sent to the quarries outside where they were harnessed to carts as beasts of draught, and others again were set to work at the ovens and baths in the city, or to perform the vilest and most repulsive tasks in the houses of their owners. Many were put on board the galleys, where they were chained to the oars or were made to serve the guns. All alike, without distinction of rank, were stigmatised with the badge of slavery by having their heads shaven and all alike were subjected to every species of torture that cruelty or cupidity could suggest to their irresponsible masters: flogged, reviled, and half-starved, they had but one source of comfort—the ministrations provided by captive clergymen or by devoted missionaries who volunteered to share their servitude and often to sacrifice their own lives for the sake of humanity. In brief, the sufferings of the Christian prisoners in the Barbary states soon became proverbial throughout Europe, and an English member of Parliament, in 1681, when trying to convey his detestation of Popery to the House, could find no stronger expression than that he had rather see his children ‘slaves under Algier than under a Popish governor.’ *

The most fortunate among these wretches were soonest delivered from bondage with money sent by their relatives at home. But the majority had to rely on charity, and while they languished in Africa, their families might perish from hunger in Europe. The cause of these helpless sufferers was pleaded by philanthropic societies, like the *Padres Redemptores* of Spain, founded specially in many countries. Collections were also made in the churches on their behalf. In this way, while thousands dragged on years of their lives in inde-

* *Hist. MSS. Comm. XII. R. Part IX. p. 113.*

scribable misery, a few hundred were from time to time restored to their homes. But rescue from African bondage did not necessarily mean recovery of personal liberty. It often meant the substitution of one form of slavery for another. The ransom ranged from £30 to £300 or £400. Now, apart from the rich who redeemed themselves and the very poor who were redeemed by public charity, there were many who found themselves under the necessity of purchasing freedom by borrowing. These escaped captivity abroad only to incur the importunity of their creditors at home. Of those also who obtained their release gratuitously many returned home crippled, mutilated by torture, or disabled for work by hardship and privation. These poor people were forced to throw themselves upon public sympathy. Thousands of beggars, armed with certificates issued by magistrates, parsons, churchwardens, and by the Trinity House authorities, might be seen wandering over the cities and counties of England. 'Gave to two poor women prisoners in Turkey 2d.' 'Given to two poor men, being some time taken captives by the Turks, and their tongues cut out, 8s.'—are two characteristic entries culled out of the Account-book of an English parish church.*

The miseries endured by the European prisoners and the losses inflicted upon European commerce by their captors, needless to say, aroused profound indignation in Europe, and efforts were made from time to time to put an end to both. Spain, the greatest sufferer from the scourge, carried on a ceaseless warfare with the Barbary corsairs; but, though her navy often succeeded in sinking pirate galleys, she was no longer able to check the evil, and her spasmodic struggles led to nothing. Not more successful were the endeavours of France to obtain by force from Algiers the redress which her Ambassador could not obtain by diplomacy at Constantinople. A French fleet was sent against the pirate stronghold in 1617; but, though it gained a victory over the Algerine galleys, it was in the end obliged to purchase a precarious peace, and the release of the French Consul who had been thrown into prison, by paying a large sum of money. Again in 1681, Louis XIV., exasperated by the outrages perpetrated by the African corsairs not only upon the French ships sailing in the Mediterranean but even upon the coast of Provence and Languedoc, declared war against them, and Vice-Admiral De Quesne was sent forth with orders to pursue and destroy their galleys wheresoever he might find them. De Quesne disabled eight Tripoline men of

* Hist. MSS. Comm. V. R. pp. 573-574.

war which he found careening in the port of Chios, and next year another French fleet bombarded Algiers. The Algerines retaliated by sending a squadron to the French coast and ravaging it. In 1683 De Quesne again bombarded Algiers, and the Algerines this time retaliated by tying the French Consul and a score of French residents to the mouths of guns and shooting them in the direction of the hostile fleet. The French continued the attack until, having nearly destroyed the town, they forced the Algerines to sue for peace. But almost immediately afterwards the pirate vessels recommenced their depredations. In 1688 a new war broke out between Algiers and France, and the preceding story repeated itself. The French Admiral D'Estrées appeared before Algiers and began to shell the city. The Algerines sent word that, if he did not desist, they would send him the French Consul in a cannon. The Admiral persisted, and they made good their promise by blowing the Consul and forty other Frenchmen from their guns. The French, by way of revenge, cut thirty Algerine slaves whom they had on board in pieces and, laying their quarters on planks, floated them towards the town. But these mutual atrocities benefited nobody, and France continued to suffer at the hands of the Barbary corsairs.

The Dutch fared no better. In 1624 their fleet forced the Dey of Algiers to liberate some Dutch ships and slaves, and again in 1661 the great admiral Ruyter with a fleet of seventeen men of war was dispatched to the Mediterranean to scour it of pirates. He took or sunk some of the largest Algerine vessels, made many prisoners, delivered some hundreds of Christian slaves, spread consternation among the rovers of Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, and concluded an advantageous peace with them. But he had no sooner sailed away than the pirates returned to their piracies, and in 1664 Ruyter was once more sent to chastise them for their perfidy. But he failed to do so ; being, in fact, compelled to release all his Barbary prisoners in order to procure the liberation of the Dutch Consul. This triumph increased the arrogance of the malefactors to such a degree that in 1675 the Divan of Algiers haughtily rejected the large sum of money offered by the Dutch government as the price of peace.

England's record in relation to the Barbary buccaneers during the seventeenth century is scarcely more glorious. After endless delays, occasioned partly by diplomatic intrigues and partly by naval inefficiency, Sir Robert Mansell sailed in 1620 from Plymouth with eighteen ships ; but after wasting six months in fruitless negotiations and aimless demonstrations

outside the harbour of Algiers, while English vessels were actually carried captive into it, he returned home having succeeded only in infuriating the enemy. The Barbary corsairs, embittered by this attack and emboldened by its failure, pushed their operations into the English shores, landing, in the summer of 1636, within twelve miles of Bristol and carrying away

'many poor Christian men, women, and children'*—and that, too, while the Admiral of the Fleet was cruising along the coast with special instructions 'to pursue all pirates and Turks infesting those parts, that so the Newfoundland fishermen and those that pass towards Bristol Fair may be protected . . . and the subjects in those parts may take knowledge of his Majesty's care of them and find the benefit of the fleet at sea.' †

By 1638, if the solemn deposition of an eye-witness is to be credited, the number of European captives at Algiers alone had reached the appalling figure of 20,000, among whom 3000 were English. ‡

Towards the end of 1640 a Committee was appointed by the House of Commons to deal with the grievance, and in the following May the House passed a resolution that his Majesty be moved to send an envoy to the Grand Signor to demand the liberation of English slaves and, should this step fail, to follow it up with the dispatch of a fleet against Algiers. The outbreak of the Civil War, however, frustrated these good resolutions, and it was not until 1655 that Admiral Blake gave to the pirates a lesson. He first visited Tunis and, on being insolently refused satisfaction, he sailed into Porto Farina, cast anchor as near the Dey's batteries as it was possible to do without running his ships aground, and, in four hours, the pirate fleet was annihilated and the fortifications of the town torn in pieces. From Tunis, Blake proceeded to Algiers, where the mere report of his exploit sufficed to secure the prompt acceptance of his terms. It was, beyond comparison, the speediest settlement of a difference with the Ottoman Empire on record; and it was entirely due to the accident that England happened to possess at the moment, in Cromwell and Blake, two men. It was not to be expected, of course, that the pirates, who seldom respected compacts signed voluntarily, would prove scrupulous in the observance of a treaty

* Hist. MSS. Comm. IV. R. p. 291.

† Ibid. III. R. p. 73.

‡ Ibid. XII. R. Part II. p. 192.

forced upon them at the cannon's mouth, and in 1657 the Protector was obliged to address to the sultan a vigorously worded protest against fresh crimes committed by his subjects. But the protest remained unheeded, for Blake was already dead and Cromwell himself died soon after.

The restoration of the Stuarts meant a return to the corruption and confusion which had paralysed England's foreign policy before the establishment of the Commonwealth, and consequently a revival of piratical aggression. Under Charles II.'s feeble and profligate administration the English navy was reduced to an incompetence the depth of which is familiar to all readers of Pepys's Diary. Even the access of external advantages could not counterbalance the effects of domestic corruption. In 1661 Charles II. received the town of Tangier as part of the dowry which Catherine of Portugal brought him, and it was anticipated that the acquisition of that stronghold on the African coast would enable England to exercise a salutary control over the Barbary corsairs. But this hope was never fulfilled. It is true that in the following year the loss of his fleet in a storm compelled the Dey of Algiers to sign a treaty of peace with the English admiral Sir John Lawson. But he paid so little attention to its provisions that hostilities were resumed in 1663, and a new peace had to be concluded in 1664 by Admiral Sir Thomas Allin who had been sent to the Mediterranean to succeed Lawson in command of the fleet which operated against the Dutch. This fresh treaty proved as abortive as the preceding one, and in 1669, soon after the conclusion of peace with Holland, Allin was once more entrusted with an expedition against the Barbary buccaneers. Allin's successor, Sir Edward Spragge, redeemed this campaign from utter futility by one brilliant exploit—the destruction of the better part of the Algerine fleet in the harbour of Bougie in 1671. This disaster cost the Dey his life at the hands of his own subjects, and his successor would fain accept the English conditions. But the lull that ensued was only temporary, as is shown by the petitions preferred to the King by English mariners captured and taken to Algiers. Indeed, the number of such captives seems to have reached about that time unprecedented proportions; for in the summer of 1670 a Committee of the Privy Council, presided over by the King in person, reported that £30,000 was needed for their redemption, and, as the victims themselves were utterly unable to procure the sum, his Majesty was prevailed upon to issue letters patent authorising those who acted on their behalf 'to take the almes and charitable benevolences of all

'our loving subjects,' and especially urging 'the inferior clergy to give effectual arguments to their flocks, both by exhortation and example, for a liberal contribution towards the redemption of these miserable wretches, whose cases are much more deplorable than theirs who ordinarily seek for relief by collections of this nature.' *

Strange as it may sound, even the calamity inflicted upon Algiers by Sir Edward Spragge failed to put an end to this intolerable disgrace, and in 1674 Sir John Narborough had to ransom some of the captives, while Charles II.'s government carried on through 1675 a tedious correspondence on the same distressing subject with the rulers of the Barbary States. These negotiations had only one result—to confirm the pirates in their evil ways, and their self-confidence was not quelled even when, at the beginning of 1676, Sir John Narborough appeared before Tripoli, broke into the harbour and took or destroyed some of the pirate men of war. A brief respite was obtained by a naval demonstration under Admiral Herbert in 1677, but it produced no lasting improvement. In spite of all the attacks already mentioned, desultory encounters too numerous to mention, and the sums of money spent in ransom, there were no fewer than 350 English vessels and over 5000 English prisoners brought into Algiers alone between 1674 and 1681; and when in the latter year two English men of war, cruising west of Tangier, captured an Algerine galley, they found on board forty English slaves and one English woman.† That year England once more declared war against Algiers, but she was obliged to conclude in haste a treaty by which Charles II. actually recognised the pirates' right to hold English subjects in slavery, unless their friends were able to offer to their masters a reasonable price for their redemption. The abandonment of Tangier set the seal upon England's humiliation, and this shameful agreement was renewed in 1686.

By the end of the seventeenth century the Barbary corsairs had succeeded in reducing all the European Powers to the condition of tributary states. Reprisals had proved worse than useless. As soon as any European nation attempted such, the Consul and the merchants of that nation, as well as the crews of the vessels that lay in the harbour of the principality affected, were consigned to the galleys. Open hostilities, as we have seen, were equally barren of permanent result. The

* Notes and Queries. 11 S. II; Hist. MSS. Comm. V. R. p. 575. VIII. R. p. 254.

† Hist. MSS. Comm. XI. R. part V. p. 68.

pirates might lose their fleet one day; they built another the next. Their walls might be battered now and then; they found no difficulty in speedily repairing them. It would seem as though no power on earth could restrain their capacity for mischief. In fact, the very nations that endeavoured to do so were forced to invigorate that capacity by their contributions in money, munitions of war, marine stores, and other presents exacted from them by the Deys either by way of bakshish, or as ransom for their captives, or in the form of an indemnity for the occasional damage done to his dominions by the naval expeditions already described. Beside these proofs of Europe's impotence it is almost idle to mention the right of searching European ships for contraband goods in the open seas which the Deys of Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli always claimed. Even that privilege, so ruinous to commerce, nation after nation had been compelled to recognise, although it was notorious that it usually served as a mask for robbery. The concession of that right to the Barbary pirates becomes all the more significant when we reflect that it was a right which their suzerain himself had already been made to abandon. The English ambassador at Constantinople, in renewing the Capitulations in 1661, had contrived to insert a clause expressly forbidding such search of English ships even by the Grand Signor's Capitan Pasha.*

How did it come about that the great powers of Europe tolerated a state of things so dishonourable and disastrous to them? The answer to this question is to be found in the relations of those powers to each other and to the Ottoman Empire. As already mentioned, the connexion between the Barbary states and the Sublime Porte had long since become merely nominal. None the less, the sultan of Turkey continued to look upon himself as the actual sovereign of Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, and upon those territories as integral parts of his empire. Therefore, while acknowledging the criminal character of his vassals' proceedings, he was apt to resent as a personal affront any measures taken to render their crimes impossible. This attitude is clearly illustrated by the manner in which the representations of the European ambassadors were treated at Constantinople. For example, when Lord Winchilsea in 1661 complained to the Porte of the outrages committed by the Algerines on English subjects, the Grand Vizier readily admitted that the Algerines 'were rogues and 'pyrates and under no subjection.' This admission, however,

* Lord Winchilsea to Secretary Nicholas, Jan. 13; March 20, 1661. S.P. Turkey. Bundle 17.

carried no permission with it. The Grand Signor, though unable to justify his vassals' conduct towards his friends, and though willing enough to confess his inability to enforce obedience to his commands, was yet extremely reluctant to allow others to take the law into their own hands. His position was both illogical and disingenuous, as the English Ambassador already quoted finally discovered :

'Algiers,' he writes, 'is regarded as a part and portion of the Grand Signor's dominions, and so not to be possessed or subdued by any other Prince without a breach of peace here. But because the Grand Signor would create no more enemies than what he can well encounter, he publicly seems to disavow the piracies of Barbary, yet covertly and underhand to cherish and encourage them to weaken and spoil the Christians, and upon all complaints of damage done by them there is that one answer : that they may sink and destroy their shipping at sea, but the towns and forts are not to be touched without the Grand Signor's revenge.' *

Now, it was pretty obvious that, without the occupation of the Barbary forts, the occasional destruction of Barbary ships served to aggravate, instead of removing, the evil. But it was equally obvious that the nation which ventured upon such an occupation would have to reckon with the Sultan of Turkey, who, it must be remembered, held in that nation's ambassador and resident merchants so many hostages for its good behaviour. In other words, a breach with Turkey meant the ruin of the Turkish trade, and for this reason the Levant Company consistently opposed all counsels of vigorous action against the Barbary States, while the English government, influenced by political as well as by commercial considerations, generally chose to submit to the insults inflicted upon its flag by the African pirates rather than provoke the sultan's wrath.

Similar considerations dictated the habitual apathy of France and Holland. Experience had taught them also that even victory could be purchased too dearly. For example, De Quesne's attack upon the Tripoline galleys in the port of Chios was at first hailed by all the European ambassadors at Constantinople as a welcome humiliation of the proud Turk from which all Christendom was likely to profit :

'His Most Christian Majesty has put the greatest affront upon this Empire that it ever received since the taking of Constantinople. . . .'

* Lord Winchilsea to Secretary Nicholas. May 24, 1662. S.P. Turkey. Bundle 17.

wrote the English ambassador. 'However things prove for the French and for this Porte, much of good must be derived from this rupture to the interest of all Christian Princes that are under a present treaty with this Court.' *

However, the jubilation was short lived. The Porte soon recovered from the panic occasioned by this unprecedented defiance. France might be all-powerful at sea; but on land her ambassador and her merchants were at the sultan's mercy. These were made to experience all the rigour of the Grand Signor's vengeance, and in the end Louis XIV. was fain to conciliate him by paying a heavy compensation for the insult offered to his authority at Chios.

But even if one of the European Powers was inclined to brave the consequences by undertaking the extirpation of the pirate nests on the African coast, it knew that in so doing it would be rousing opposition from the others. The commercial jealousy of those Powers in the East was only equalled by their political rivalry in the West, and none of them could contemplate with equanimity the increase of prestige and strength which would accrue to its competitor through the occupation of Algiers, Tunis, or Tripoli. Holland, for instance, in 1661 earnestly urged France, Spain, and England to assist her in a crusade against the Moslem corsairs. But these states had quite other objects in view, and two of them at least were at the time planning the ruin of Holland rather than of Algiers. The same jealousy time and again frustrated all efforts at combined action, each power endeavouring to turn the distress of the others to personal account rather than to co-operate with them against the common enemy. These reasons amply account for the humiliating timidity which was the usual attitude of the great nations of Europe towards the African rogues throughout the seventeenth century.

The eighteenth century inherited from its predecessor all the international rivalries which made for disunion and weakness on the part of Christendom; and the Moslem pirates in the Mediterranean continued to prosper on the dissensions of their enemies rather than through any intrinsic strength of their own. For it can easily be shown that the general decline of the Ottoman Empire had been shared by its African dependencies. The frequent insurrections of the Janissaries, the anarchy consequent on the assassination of Dey after Dey, the chronic feuds between Algiers and Tunis, the ceaseless

* Sir John Finch to Secretary Jenkins, July 25, Sept. 22, 1681, S.P. Turkey. Bundle 19.

turbulence of the wild tribes of the hinterland, and the terrible ravages of the plague had greatly impaired the defensive resources of the Barbary states. According to a contemporary authority, the whole military force of Algiers in 1732 did not exceed 6500 undisciplined men, 2000 of whom were too old for active service, and the rest dispersed widely over sea and land. Its naval force consisted of only half-a-dozen ships of war. Its fortifications, on the land side, were in a state of decay, and the ditch which formerly surrounded the city was almost entirely filled up. It is true that the fortifications facing the sea were better preserved and better armed; but none of them were assisted with mines or advanced works and, as the soldiers who guarded them could not be kept up to any regular courses of duty, a few resolute battalions, it was believed, if protected by a small squadron of ships, would have experienced no great difficulty in making themselves masters of the city. But the powers of Europe, absorbed in mutual hostilities, were unable to take advantage of the pirates' weakness, and the latter availed themselves of every European upheaval in order to increase their depredations afloat and their exactions ashore, making no secret of the fact that they regarded the spoliation of the Christians as their best source of revenue, and frankly declaring that the observance of treaty obligations was fatal to their welfare. The Deys might be averse from a policy of adventure, preferring the safer course of filling their own pockets by fleecing the European merchants in their dominions; but they were obliged to yield to the clamour of the soldiery and of the populace for plunder. For example, in 1754 the people of Algiers murmured for war, complaining that peace was a departure from tradition, and pointing out that their cruisers had either to be maintained at an unremunerative outlay of money or to be suffered to rot in idleness. The Dey refused to listen to these arguments and was assassinated. His successor made himself popular by a more vigorous policy.

A formal declaration of hostilities, however, was not considered an indispensable excuse for spoliation. At any moment the Barbary galleys might attack European ships regardless of the flag under which they sailed, and comparative exemption could only be secured by an adequate offer of gifts. The powers of Europe, caring more for the attainment of the end than for the dignity of the means employed, were only too ready to submit to these conditions. Every demand made by the Barbary Deys, no matter how unreasonable it might be in itself, or how insolently it might be made, met with compliance. The futility of reasoning with a Turk had long since been acknowledged both

by the European ambassadors at Constantinople, and by the European consuls at Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli. But, instead of having recourse to the alternative of force—the only thing the Turk respected—they earned his contempt by stooping to flattery, and they fed his rapacity by submitting to bakshish. ‘Give a Turk money with one hand and he will ‘permit his eyes to be plucked out with the other’ was a maxim upon which all the great nations of Europe habitually acted in their dealings both with the sultan and his vassals. It is no wonder, then, if the Turk took full advantage of this accommodating disposition. Thus, in 1754, the Dey of Algiers asked some of the European Powers to appoint a new consul every three years, so that he might the more often receive the presents customary on the occasion. In 1764 another Dey of Algiers, finding several Powers, whom he had affronted in the persons of their representatives, arming in earnest against him, signified to the other Powers, with whom he was at peace, that, in lieu of the usual gifts, he expected from each of them a ship of war completely equipped, stored, and armed, to be navigated into his port at their own expense.* In 1791 another Dey of Algiers decided that the annual presents made by the European consuls should be doubled. Such were the relative positions of the Powers of Christendom and the Moslem corsairs throughout the eighteenth century, and though some of the former now and then endeavoured to emancipate themselves from this disgraceful dependence on people they despised none of them ever succeeded.

Spain in 1733 suffered heavy losses by sea and land at the hands of the Algerines. Sixteen years later she made another fruitless effort. In 1760 Algiers was blockaded by a Spanish squadron. In 1775 the Spanish admiral, Count O’Reilly, sailed with fifty-one ships and some 24,000 troops on a like errand, but he was routed and obliged to retire, leaving a considerable portion of his army dead on the African coast, besides many guns and large quantities of munitions of war in the hands of the enemy. Similar campaigns were repeated in 1783 and 1784, and in 1785 Spain, convinced at last of the hopelessness of her efforts, was glad to buy peace with 1,000,000 piastres, and a quantity of military stores.

The Italians suffered not less grievously than the Spaniards from frequent descents on their coasts by the Barbary corsairs, who, in 1749, had completely interrupted the commerce of Italy. The Pope undertook the part of deliverer, and he not

* The Gentleman’s Magazine, Oct. 1764, p. 496.

only ordered his own galleys to be prepared for an expedition, but induced Genoa and Malta to join their forces with his. It was even reported that Naples and Venice also had agreed to co-operate with Portugal and Spain in a common campaign for the subjection of Algiers. But this ambitious project came to nothing; for, according to contemporary opinion, the Great Powers were opposed to the reduction of any of the pirate states, 'since it might cause a diminution of the commerce of their own subjects, which they are able to protect, and transfer it to the petty states of Italy, who have not at present separately, either weight or force enough to secure a free navigation.*

Be that as it may, instead of the Italian states attacking Algiers, eleven Algerine ships sailed to the coast of Naples with the intention of seizing the King as he was 'hunting pheasants.' †

The Dutch concluded a new treaty with the Algerines in 1726; but, though the document had cost them twelve years' fighting and a rich offering of naval stores, it did not render them immune from outrage, and in 1738 the Dutch Consul lodged a vigorous complaint with the Dey. The latter answered with instructive frankness:

'All that you have said in this affair would be very good if the constitution of our State was other than it is. You know perfectly well that we could not support ourselves were it not for the prizes which we take from the Christian nations. It is now more than two years since we made any captures of consequence. We must, therefore, make ourselves amends by acting in another manner. In short, we have been at peace with you so long that all our privateers are weary of it, and well they may, because we are likewise at peace with Great Britain, France, and Sweden: too many at one time! We must break with some of you.' ‡

It was only by the regular dispatch of presents that Holland managed to pacify the Algerine and the other Barbary corsairs. And when the presents were satisfactory the Dey would indite a pompous epistle to the States General, graciously assuring them that 'Now our friendship and affection towards you is augmented.' §

The complaisance of the Dutch was dictated by painful experience, and it stood them in good stead throughout the eighteenth century. The Danes in 1770 attempted a more

* *The Gentleman's Magazine*, Sept. 1749, p. 334.

† *Ibid.* p. 431.

‡ *Ibid.* March 1738, p. 167.

§ *Ibid.* Sept. 1749, p. 407.

dignified policy, and Admiral Kaas was commissioned to carry it out. But, as the event proved, it would have been better for Denmark to have imitated Holland's humility. The Danish squadron, consisting of four ships of the line, two frigates, two bomb-vessels, and one fire-ship, anchored on the road of Algiers, and submitted certain terms to the Dey. The Dey, for answer, fitted out six galleys, which made a bold attempt in the night to carry off the Danish bomb-vessels. The Danish admiral thereupon began to bombard the city; the forts replied briskly; but not a single shot on either side took effect. These stage hostilities went on for twelve days, and on the twelfth the Admiral, hoisting the white flag, sent to the Dey a letter which was refused. The Danes lingered two days longer, but, unable to obtain a reply, they at last weighed anchor and put an end to what a writer of the day aptly describes as 'an unaccountable expedition.' *

Two years later the breach was terminated by a peace as little to Denmark's advantage as the campaign had been to her glory. The Danish government consented to pay to the pirates 50,000 Algerine sequins (about £25,000), besides a large quantity of military and naval stores. The contemporary critic comments:

'It undoubtedly will be a matter of astonishment to future ages that, at a time when the naval force and commerce of Europe are arrived at an extent of greatness unknown in any other period or part of the world, so many powerful States, who are watchful of every opportunity of advantage to go to war with each other, should submit to the ignominy of paying a shameful tribute to the paltry nests of pirates, who rather infest than inhabit the Barbary coasts.' †

This comment gains additional point from a survey of the attitude maintained towards the Barbary corsairs by the two greatest maritime powers of the period. England's position in the Mediterranean had been strengthened enormously through the acquisition of Gibraltar and Minorca in 1713. Yet she saw fit to renew, in 1729, the dishonourable treaty with Algiers already cited, and, upon finding as usual that the treaty by itself was not worth the paper it was written on, she strove to obtain some small measure of security for her commerce by a continual dispatch of presents to the pirates. One illustration will suffice:

* *The Annual Register* 1770, p. 45.

† *Ibid.* 1772, p. 79.

' The following goods, designed as a present from his Majesty to the Dey of Algiers, to redeem near 100 English captives lately taken, were entered at the Custom House, viz. 20 pieces of broad cloath, 2 pieces of brocade, 2 pieces of silver tabby, 1 piece of green damask, 8 pieces of holland, 16 pieces of cambrick, a gold repeating watch, 4 silver ditto, 20 pounds of tea, 300 of loaf sugar, 5 fuzees, 5 pair of pistols, an escrutoire, 2 clocks, and a box of toys.' *

Englishmen were not, of course, blind to the indignity of this policy. But they saved their conscience and their pride by the specious argument that it was not

' perhaps prudent to engage in a war with nations which may in some measure be protected by their weakness, upon whom no reprisals can be made, and whose armaments, such as they are, can be renewed as often as they are destroyed with less inconvenience than we must suffer in destroying them. If war and negotiations have equal probability of success, let our humanity and our religion turn the balance.' †

France had renewed her treaties with Algiers in 1719, but the terms were such as to encourage the Algerines in the belief that they could deal with Frenchmen as seemed good to themselves. In 1754 and in 1763 France had again the mortification of seeing her consuls thrown into prison by the Dey of Algiers—an expedient that never failed to yield both prestige and profit to the Dey. In 1770 French *amour propre* was somewhat flattered by a successful display of force against Tunis. The pirates of that state had, since the conquest of Corsica by France, made a practice of capturing all Corsican barques, and enslaving the crews. They also drove the French African Company from a valuable coral fishery on their coast. The French Government dispatched a small squadron to Tunis, with a demand of 800,000 livres for the expense of the expedition, and 200,000 for the loss of the coral fishery. The Dey equivocated for some days. Then the French commander, having withdrawn all French subjects from Tunis, and left a few frigates to cruise at the mouth of the harbour, sailed with the rest of the squadron to Biserta, bombarded the town, and burnt some galleots in its port. Thence he proceeded to Sufa and some other Tunisian places on the coast, serving them all in the same way. The Dey, fearing for his capital, immediately

* The Gentleman's Magazine, Feb. 1734, p. 104.

† Ibid. Feb. 1749, p. 94. Cp. The Westminster Journal, June 3, Sept. 23, 1749.

consented to give satisfaction.* But against Algiers France remained as powerless as ever, and in 1789 she was obliged to conclude another onerous and dishonourable treaty with that state.

Such, in barest outline, was the condition of the Mediterranean in an age when its waters were constantly overrun by the navies of the greatest maritime powers in the world. As has been seen, the main cause which had so long enabled the African pirates to defy all those powers, and to defeat each of them in turn, was the irreconcilable rivalry by which they were divided. The same cause still continued to act in favour of piracy. During the international convulsions that followed the French Revolution no European nation could afford to divert its attention from the dangers that threatened its existence to a nuisance that merely affected its prosperity and dignity. Even the protagonists in the great drama were obliged to connive at insults and injuries which they had not the time to resent. The French fleet, which had so easily subdued the impregnable fortress of Malta, and the French army, which had very nearly succeeded in conquering Egypt, would have found small difficulty in suppressing Algiers. But Napoleon was more intent upon crushing England's power than upon extirpating piracy. Therefore when, in 1800, the Dey of Algiers undertook to avenge the invasion of Egypt by imprisoning all French citizens in his territory, Napoleon readily agreed to ransom them, and, on the Sultan refusing to sanction the bargain, he acquiesced in their expulsion.

Equally instructive is England's attitude. At that time the English fleets sailed supreme over the Mediterranean. But Nelson was as deeply absorbed in fighting France as Napoleon was in fighting England :

'I have been towards Algiers,' he writes to Lady Hamilton, on the 20th of January 1804, 'where I sent a ship with Mr. Falcon, our Consul, whom the Dey turned away, but the Dey has been made so insolent by Mr. North's conduct in giving him £30,000 that nothing, I suppose, but a flogging will put him in order ; and, with the French fleet ready to put to sea, that I have no time for.' †

Curiously enough, the only castigation administered to the Barbary miscreants during this period was administered by a nation which, owing to its distance, might have been considered the last in the world to venture upon such action. The United

* The Annual Register, 1770, p. 54.

† Hist. MSS. Comm. IX. R. Part II. p. 487.

States of America had, ever since the declaration of their independence, endured many wrongs at the hands of these pirates. Vessels flying the Stars and Stripes had been looted again and again, and not a few citizens of the New World might be found in Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli sharing the misery of European slaves. The Republic, however, did not yet feel strong enough to vindicate its honour, and in 1793 the American President, following the example of the princes of Europe, purchased peace from the Dey of Algiers on the usual terms: a sum of money, a quantity of munitions of war, and other gifts paid at once, to be supplemented by a yearly tribute. These gains, however, did not satisfy the greed of the Dey very long; and, tempted by America's growing traffic, he expelled the American Consul and merchants in 1812, declaring that the bakshish sent by their Government was no longer proportionate to the benefits which they owed to his forbearance. This outrage was immediately followed by the spoliation of all American ships that came within reach of the Algerine cruisers. The other Barbary states hastened to join in the hunt. The Republic, after bearing with this treatment patiently for three years, in 1815 dispatched to the Mediterranean a squadron which appeared before Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli in turn. The Deys of all three states, taken unawares, submitted to the American terms with phenomenal alacrity, and for a time at all events the Barbary corsairs appeared inclined to pay to the Stars and Stripes a respect they felt for no other Christian flag.

This successful display of vigour on the part of a new and remote power was calculated to sting older and nearer nations to emulation. The moment was favourable for the practical expression of that feeling. Napoleon's career had just come to an end, and Europe, after many years of storm, was at last enjoying an interval of comparative calm. England determined to seize the opportune moment, and early in 1816 an English fleet under Lord Exmouth was sent to the Barbary coast with orders to wrest from the pirates full reparation for their past misdeeds and guarantees of better conduct in the future. Tunis and Tripoli, unable to offer any resistance, promptly agreed to deliver, for a moderate ransom, all Christian prisoners, and to abstain from taking any more. The Dey of Algiers tried to gain time by proposing to negotiate direct with London and Constantinople. Lord Exmouth allowed himself to be duped, and the perfidious Algerines utilised the respite by throwing the English Consul into prison and massacring at Bone a number of Neapolitan fishermen who had landed for the purpose of celebrating Ascension Day. Lord Exmouth

was ordered back to Algiers with a squadron composed of fifteen men of war and four bomb-vessels. A Dutch squadron of six vessels met the English at Gibraltar and volunteered to participate in its mission. The eyes of all Europe were fixed upon the Anglo-Dutch fleet as it sailed towards Algiers. International jealousies were for the moment forgotten, and every civilised country felt that the expedition was one of universal importance. Christian Europe was at last making a sincere if tardy effort to redeem its reputation, and to cleanse the world of a secular stain.

The combined forces arrived outside Algiers on the 1st of August, delivered an ultimatum six days later, and, on failing to obtain an answer, proceeded to extremes. Of the action which ensued, a new and stirring account will be found in the interesting memoir of Lord Hardwicke, that stands second on our list at the head of this article. The subject of the memoir served at the time as midshipman on board Lord Exmouth's flagship *Queen Charlotte*, and took a gallant part in the 'battle of Algiers.' For our present purpose it is sufficient to state that the performance was a repetition, on a grander scale, of Blake's achievement at Tunis in 1655. In the space of a few hours the whole of the Algerine fleet of thirty-seven vessels was burnt or blown up, the batteries on shore were silenced, and the fortifications of the city on the sea side reduced to a heap of ruins. The upshot was an abject submission to every one of the English conditions, among which the principal was the final abolition of Christian slavery without distinction of creed or race. The mission had fulfilled the hopes of the civilised world, and all the nations that had followed its course with their good wishes hastened to demonstrate their gratitude for its success. Lord Exmouth was overwhelmed with honours. His own sovereign raised him to the dignity of a viscount. The City of London presented him with its freedom and a richly ornamented sword. Spain, Naples, Sardinia, and Holland showered orders upon him. The Pope rewarded his service to Christendom with a valuable cameo.

It was not long, however, before the Algerines rebuilt their fleet, repaired their forts, and resumed their depredations. Nor did a fresh naval expedition undertaken by England in 1824 lead to anything but an agreement as profitable to the pirates as it was discreditable to herself. By this agreement the English Consul was bound not to display the Union Jack in the city of Algiers, to visit the Dey on foot—while his Moham-medan servants might ride, to doff his hat as soon as he came

in sight of the Dey's residence, and to divest himself of his sword before he came into the arch-rogue's august presence. Upon the causes of that unbelievable disgrace we cannot dwell in this place. The effect of it was to raise the insolence and the iniquity of the Algerines to a higher pitch than ever. Christian Europe, in the persons of its representatives, official and unofficial, lay once more prostrate at the feet of the Moslem pirates of Africa. But, bitterly as all European nations resented their humiliation, they would have resented more bitterly still any successful step taken by any of them for its removal. For now, as in older days, such removal could only be effected by the permanent occupation of the Barbary strongholds, and now, as in older days, no power would permit another to carry out that occupation. It was not until 1830 that France decided to accomplish the task which England had left unfinished. The immediate excuse for the decision was a financial transaction between the French Government and some Algerine Jews dating from Napoleon's Egyptian campaign. The Dey of Algiers had a personal interest in the matter, and failing to procure a satisfactory settlement from France had, three years before, insulted her Consul in public. The French Government had lost no time in dispatching a fleet and army for his punishment. But that force, though it invested Algiers, conducted its operations with a laxity which drew upon France the derision of the world at the time. It is not improbable that the incompetence of the French forces was due to a reluctance on the part of the French Government to face the diplomatic complications which more drastic measures would have created rather than to military inefficiency. However that may be, in the summer of 1830 France proved that she was quite able to deal with the situation in a manner worthy of her traditions. On the 14th of June an army 35,000 strong landed on the African coast, and, after several obstinate engagements with the Algerine troops, advanced against Algiers, opening fire upon its walls on July 4th. The assault began in the morning. Before nightfall the Dey agreed to surrender the city, and on the following day the French took possession of the pirate citadel, thus putting an end to the sinister power which had for three centuries terrorised the Mediterranean, retarded the civilisation of Southern Europe, and inflicted incalculable losses upon the commerce of Christendom.

ART. IX.—ROMAN SCOTLAND.

1. *A Roman Frontier Post and its People: the Fort of Newstead, in the Parish of Melrose.* By JAMES CURLE. Glasgow : Maclehose. 1911.
2. *The Roman Wall in Scotland.* By GEORGE MACDONALD. Glasgow : Maclehose. 1911.
3. *Corstopitum, Reports of the Excavations, 1907-9.* Newcastle-on-Tyne.
4. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 1899-1906.* Edinburgh.
5. *The Roman Forts on the Bar Hill.* By GEORGE MACDONALD and ALEXANDER PARK. Glasgow : Maclehose. 1906.

IMPERIAL frontiers bordering an uncivilised world are a common theme of modern writers. The mountains, deserts, and marshes where such frontiers mostly run afford strange and romantic scenes ; the actions which take place there are fierce and wild adventures, crowded in quick incisive change, and the men who act are strong and resourceful, shaped in the furnace of ceaseless labour and single-handed daring. But these frontiers are something more than a background for the modern Odysseus or a school for virile character. They have also their prose. It is a record of things which are not at all amusing—of ever-shifting boundaries ; of little costly wars, as needless as inevitable ; of forts and roadways which must be built and maintained in difficult and desolate regions ; of frontier officers as unruly as any native mountaineer. It is this prose which really matters. If we ask about the vitality of an Empire or the thoroughness of its machinery or the power of its statesmen to balance vigour with economy, the distant frontiers answer us. An island Empire such as ours has, indeed, other and nearer frontiers that need keener guard than any boundary-line in India or in Africa. Yet the centre even of our own dominions must at times be sought on the circumference.

We propose here to describe, from this point of view, one ancient frontier of which the geography at least is well known to English readers—the frontier which the Roman Emperors upheld for three hundred years in northern Britain. The story will perforce be unadorned. No doubt the three centuries during which Roman marched with Caledonian were as full of noble deeds—and for that matter, as full of ignoble deeds

—as all the later years of English and Scottish border warfare. But good deeds and bad have alike passed into forgetfulness. Neither the ancient historians of Rome nor their readers cared much for the cult of the individual. The whole range of Roman historical literature contains barely half a dozen frontier anecdotes; of frontier ballads not a line survives; even the epitaphs on the tombstones of the border regiments are few and reticent. Nor can the gap be filled. A Kipling may transfer to Roman Northumberland the fortunes of frontier posts beneath the Karakoram or the Hindu Khush, and his fiction may be quite as true as many histories. But its truth is general and not special. It is a tale of a typical frontier and not of Roman Britain. It is poet's not historian's work. Besides, the poet has in the end to come to details, and the details are his danger. Mr. Kipling, in his brilliant story, has transferred to Roman Britain much more than a typical frontier history. His Picts are Indian friendlies; his Roman frontier troops are mostly English town-bred soldiers in ancient uniforms. Neither such friendlies nor such town-bred soldiers, we believe, were to be found on the Caledonian frontier of Rome.

But there is compensation for the lost romance. The historian can find in the Roman rule of northern Britain plenty of those details which reveal the secret strengths and weaknesses of empires. The Caledonian frontier was remote from Rome; it lay, indeed, beyond an arm of Ocean. Its precise conditions, its topography, its needs and possibilities were little known in Italy, and Roman statesmen often differed widely on its importance. It will tell us better than any other Roman frontier, whether the central government understood what frontier defence meant for the Roman Empire, and whether it was strong enough to sustain that defence without dangerous neglect, and prudent enough to do it without dangerous extravagance.

It is only during the last few years and indeed the last few months that it has become possible to ask such questions in relation to Roman Scotland. In 1899, when the subject of Roman Britain was last discussed in this Review (vol. 189, pp. 369 foll.), the fragment of history which we wish now to set forth was practically unknown. The Reviewer was able to sketch many aspects of Roman Britain, and we believe that his article is substantially as true to-day as it was in 1899; the discoveries of the past twelve years, however much they have widened knowledge, have moved for the most part on lines which could then be foreseen. But in respect of Roman Scotland a new field has been opened. New facts have come to

light which could not be anticipated in 1899. An additional chapter of history has to be written.

A few sentences will sum up the little that was known twelve years ago of northern Britain in the Roman period. The Wall of Hadrian, which stretched from Tyne to Solway, was, of course, familiar both to antiquaries and to many who were not antiquaries but cared to tramp the Northumberland heather and trace its amazing ruins. Portions of these ruins had been excavated and fairly accurate and serviceable descriptions were in print. But of its history large tracts lay still unexplored; the ages of its various component fortifications could not be defined with any certainty, and the adjacent country north and south of it, the roads and forts which kept it in touch with York and Chester and the other roads and forts which provided communication further north, were with two or three exceptions wholly unexplored. The northern Wall, the so-called Antonine Vallum, which Pius built from Forth to Clyde, was even less understood, and the curiosity which was just awaking had as yet yielded little result. Of the land beyond the Wall, of the Roman roads and posts in the counties of Stirling and Fife and Perth, little more was known in 1899 than three generations earlier when Scott published his 'Antiquary,' in the year of Waterloo. In one way, indeed, less was known. For the source on which Scott's antiquarian friends had relied, the biography of Agricola by Tacitus, was coming to be recognised as a work which gave little help to the historian. True, Agricola ruled Britain for seven years and pierced his way into the far North, and Tacitus has much to say of his successes. But scores of efforts had been made to connect his campaigns with specific sites in Scotland, and all had failed. That wonderful and eloquent pamphlet, so extraordinarily instructive in its remarks on human and on Roman life, had been tested as a geographical manual and had—most reasonably—been found wanting. Only three concrete facts of Romano-Scottish history could be called certain twelve years ago—that Agricola invaded the country about A.D. 80, that Pius built his Wall about A.D. 140, that the Roman occupation ended about A.D. 180, and the third of these dates, which was based on an archaeological survey of Roman coins found north of Cheviot, was in 1899 a novel conclusion, not yet generally known.

Twelve years have let in light. A long series of excavations promoted principally by the Scottish Society of Antiquaries, has probed nearly a dozen Roman sites. In 1899, a Roman road and various block-houses (apparently, wooden towers) connected therewith were unearthed in the policies of Gask,

six miles east of Perth. In 1900 Roman forts were attacked at Camelon near Falkirk, and Lyne near Peebles. In 1901 the search was extended to the large earthworks of Inchtuthill, in the policies of Delvine, near Dunkeld. In 1903-5 three forts in the Wall of Pius were successively explored, at Castle Cary, Rough Castle and Bar Hill. Finally in 1905-10 Mr. James Curle dug patiently and systematically through the large fort at Newstead, on the Tweed, beside Melrose. Other work has been achieved south of the Border. At Corbridge on Tyne, the Roman *Corstopitum*—three miles south of Hadrian's Wall—excavations were begun on a large scale in 1908, and useful smaller efforts have been made along the Wall itself.

¶ Not all these undertakings have been equally well achieved. The earlier ones were marred by those defects which cling to all beginnings. Sites were not excavated completely; remains were not probed to the bottom, where the final truth lies hid; coins and potsherds and other small dateable objects were not minutely noted; some of the work will have one day to be done over again. But the later researches stand clear of such reproach, and the whole series bears honourable witness to sustained and ever more successful endeavour. The world at large has paid scant attention to these long labours. The average Englishman indeed gives little heed to archæological inquiries even at his own doors. Bicyclists and sometimes even a motorist may look over the hedge and ask what all this digging means; a half holiday brings a 'trip' of curious pick-nickers from a neighbouring town, a schoolmaster and his pupils, a vicar and his choir; the village constable and the rural postman look in more or less regularly, and a rare reporter comes for copy. For the rest, the excavator is left to his lonely furrow. But this furrow is not barren.

A passing glance at the three most important of these excavations will perhaps show best both their character and their results. Corbridge, the most southern of the three and, we suppose, the first to become Roman, stands beside the Tyne, fifteen miles above Newcastle. Here the hills recede, and a rich and pleasant valley bids men come and dwell. The Romans, driving their military road from York towards Scotland, found here a fertile and sheltered nook to plant a fort and bridge the river. The English, not conquerors only but settlers, placed their homes rather in another corner of the valley, three miles away on the hill now crowned by Hexham Abbey. But a few preferred the Roman site. They squatted outside the tangle of its haunted ruins, yet near enough to quarry in them, and there built Corbridge. On a low cliff above the Tyne, the

houses of a tiny town still cluster round a grey church tower, and below them a long bridge runs out with many arches across the river. As the evening sun lights up the bridge and town and tower, and makes

‘den Silberbach in goldne Strömen fließen,’

it is strangely beautiful. Here, as indeed not seldom, the excavator's lot is cast in pleasant places. The excavations themselves, guided by a body of Oxford and Northumberland archæologists, are incomplete. In part, too, they are hard to unravel. Generation after generation of Romans built and rebuilt here, and barbarians pillaged, and medieval churchmen dug for stone, and King John—and doubtless not King John only—dug for gold, and none of all these left things quite as neat as an archæologist would like. But the Corbridge finds already count as the most important of their kind in northern England. The lowest, earliest strata yield vestiges of Agricola's age: he, it seems, brought the Roman road here, bridged the river and built the first fort. In higher strata, that is, later in date, are buildings of the second century, military in character, though not laid out in the stereotyped plan of a Roman fortress. Two of these are well-wrought granaries, each with its carefully ventilated basement excluding the damp. A third, covering the enormous area of some seventy yards square, and walled with huge ‘bossed’ masonry—much like the Strozzi Palace at Florence—was probably a depot for army stores, and perhaps also for cattle or horses. Close by is the wreck of a decorated fountain and a spacious, much-worn watering-trough. These structures date from the great age of Corstopitum, the second century, when it was a store-base for Roman armies conquering the North. When those invasions ceased, its importance shrank. But men dwelt there till the last Roman days. At the very end of the fourth century, some one—perhaps before he left the place, perhaps when enemies were attacking—hid in a chink within a house-wall a packet of gold coins. Fortune denied him the chance to reclaim it; now a twentieth century excavator has come upon it, and it is likely to cause a curious lawsuit in the matter of treasure trove. Sculptures, too, have been found—reliefs of sun gods and deified emperors, and the ‘Corbridge Lion,’ carved by a man who knew more of dogs than lions, but uniquely forceful and alive—and a mullioned window which claims to be the oldest known to architects, and a store of coins and pottery which outweighs the whole recorded yield of the neighbouring Roman Wall.

From Corbridge a Roman road, once known as Dere Street

—was it the street beset by wild beasts?—can still be traced across the lonely moors of Redesdale and Coquethead to Newstead, near Melrose on the Tweed. Here, under the magical shadows of the Eildon peaks, we meet again many of the features and more than all the charm of Corbridge. Again, a smiling valley widens among the hills and a Roman fort and a medieval abbey are within it. The Roman reached it, as he had reached Corbridge, when he drove his road northwards. As he came over the ridge of Cheviot, the Eildon summits rose far on his northern horizon; by them he laid the line of his road, and at their foot he found a site for a fort and a river crossing. In later times a 'new steading' grew up outside the old ruins, and a town arose two miles away at 'holy Melrose.' Mr. Curle began to dig here in 1905, thinking (he tells us) that a few months' work lay before him. His labourers were busy for the better part of five years; his finds have crowded the National Museum in Edinburgh to helpless overflowing. He found the outlines of a fort of more than usual size, enlarged and altered three or four times over, with most of its internal buildings well preserved. He found outside it a hundred rubbish pits, deep enough to try his skill and courage, and deep enough also to hide treasures. He found, too, deposits of smaller objects which had been buried in the successive reconstructions of the fort, which could be dated and adduced as chronological evidence. The gain was great to history and to archæology. For the historian three critical facts emerged—that Newstead fort was founded by Agricola; that, after his recall, it was held for many years and was then lost; that, thirdly, it was re-occupied again by Pius, and finally lost about 180 A.D. From these facts, as we shall see, much history can be reconstructed. Light, too, was thrown on the dating and stylistic developement of Roman pottery, which is now becoming one of the recognised clues to the chronology of Roman remains in all lands. For the rest, since we cannot mention everything, we instance one notable discovery. Mr. Curle's store of Roman armour, dug up out of his rubbish pits, is extensive and indeed unique. One iron helmet-mask, used as it seems for parade, has been called—and very justly called—the finest piece of ironwork which Roman art has left us.

The third excavation which we wish to mention concerns a smaller and less surprising site. Bar Hill is a low summit on the line of the Wall of Pius, midway between Forth and Clyde. The vestiges of a Roman fort had long ago been noted here; they are on rising ground a little distance behind the actual rampart of Pius. At the cost of the landowner

Mr. Whitelaw of Gartshore, Dr. Macdonald and his colleagues set themselves to excavate these vestiges in 1902. They found, buried only a little beneath the grass, abundant traces of a fort belonging to the same period as the Wall. Its ditches, its ramparts of regularly laid turf-sods, its stone-built headquarters and granary and bath-house, its wooden barracks, could all be followed out; its garrison was perhaps 500 men. Then, sinking deeper, they came upon an older smaller fort, a tiny stronghold, girt (it seemed) with many ditches and earthworks set as if to stay that Highland charge which has broken every unfortified battle order in every age. Its garrison can have been barely 150 men; if the clans came down upon them, they needed every device of engineering skill. One still deeper find was made which demands quotation. From the bottom of a well, the peculiar home of truth, there was brought up a little parcel of tin coins, cheap copies of ordinary Roman silver issues. They were minted (it seems) as offerings to the gods. The prudent Roman by a legal prohibition forbade them to be tendered to ordinary men; they served at Bar Hill to gratify the deity of the well.

Many excavators find it easier to dig than to write. In all the excavations with which we are now concerned, the wise rule has prevailed that no site be dug up without a scientific record of the finds. Reports of all the excavations have been issued regularly and punctually, and these reports, though they vary somewhat in merit, are all of them useful and substantial. The most remarkable of them is unquestionably Mr. Curle's account of his Newstead labours. It is minute and scientific, especially in its handling of the pottery and small objects; it is readable—though its bulk almost demands a reading-desk—and in its outward form and print and illustration it is the stateliest volume on Romano-British antiquities which has appeared for many years. To match it, one must go back to the sumptuous quartos in which the late General Pitt-Rivers immortalised the Romano-British villages traceable on his Dorsetshire estates. By the side of this splendid Report may fitly be placed another admirable volume which is not a report of excavation but is no less germane to our topic. This is a well-written and well-illustrated account of the Wall of Pius by Dr. George Macdonald, one of our ablest archæologists and a collaborator in the Bar Hill excavations. Relying partly on the excavations which we have been reviewing and partly on his own researches, its author has been able both to work out much that is new and true about this Wall and also to give his readers a complete,

learned and judicious summary of all that is at present knowable about it.

These excavations and inquiries have borne good fruit. We can now, in 1911, attempt with reasonable confidence to sketch the history of the Romano-Caledonian border, the *limes Caledonicus* as the Romans themselves might have called it. We can trace, with some fulness and some definiteness, the various stages by which the Empire moved forward or shrank backwards in Britain, can assign dates, can describe the systems of defence in use at various times, and can add some reasonable conjectures as to the causes which influenced the whole development.

The tale begins twenty-five years after the invasion of Britain by the Emperor Claudius. During those first years Caledonia lay far below the Roman horizon. The Romans, like nearly all conquerors of Britain—the English, for instance, and the Normans—made quick and easy progress across the open plains and gentle hills of the south, the east and the midlands; that required only three or four years. But they halted when they came face to face with the tangled uplands of the north and west; here there was a long pause. For many years the western limit of Roman Britain was not far west of a line drawn from Newport through Shrewsbury to Chester, nor the northern limit far north of Chester, Derby and Lincoln. Perhaps the hills and the hill-tribes were not the only obstacles in the path of the conquerors. Time was needed to absorb the lowland area, and in particular to take in the protectorates which here, as everywhere, were used as stepping-stones to annexation. The rising of Boudicca (Boadicea) showed plainly enough the danger of great haste in carrying this absorption through. The Roman garrison at this time was barely forty thousand men, and the Government of Nero had neither the wish nor, as it seems, the power to increase it. Nero, indeed, that strange and repulsive mixture of shallow idealism and downright vice, was not an emperor to trouble about Britain, and his ministers had their hands full in the East. Till Nero's death the line of Newport, Chester and Lincoln represented in the main the Roman boundaries.

Nero fell; the Flavian dynasty, Vespasian and his sons, restored vigour to the Imperial administration, and conquests followed. The lowlands of Britain had now grown used to Roman rule; possibly even the hill-tribes had learnt something of civilisation; able generals had no difficulty in moving forward. In seven years (70-77 A.D.) Wales and Yorkshire were subdued and a network of roads and forts was spread over

them. In seven years more the remainder of northern Britain and the south of Scotland became Roman ; forts and roads were built throughout those regions and permanent occupation was attempted as far north as Perthshire. The first chapter of Scottish history opens.

One man is especially connected with these Scottish campaigns. Julius Agricola was sent by Vespasian to govern Britain in 77 or 78, and recalled by Domitian seven years later. His is a famous name. Antiquaries have probably ceased to christen their children and town councils to call streets and terraces after him, but his memory is preserved for ever in the biography which his son-in-law, Tacitus, wrote. He is a typical figure, significant of his age. Like Tacitus and Tacitus' friend Pliny, he belonged to that new social class, drawn from the remoter parts of Italy and from the provinces, which rose to prominence in the Flavian period and slowly superseded the old senatorial families. He was bourgeois in rank, and bourgeois also in his virtues and his faults. He lacked the characteristic pride of the old senators, the stubbornest aristocracy known to history. Their contempt, half magnificent and half inhuman, for the emperors who ruled them and for the dependents who served them, for personal danger and for the misery of others, their uncompromising obstinacy, their colossal wealth and splendid luxury and extravagant vices, were all equally foreign to this respectable middle-class official. Instead, a shrewd obsequiousness helped him easily to fit his conduct to the times, to serve under Nero, to die in his bed under Domitian. *Peritus obsequi eruditusque utilia honestis miscere*, 'quick to obey and trained to unite honour with advantage'—so his son-in-law sums him up, damning him with strange praise, and revealing by an unconscious candour the temper of an age and class.

But he had also the bourgeois virtues. Simple in manner, unselfish in finance, able and industrious in business, cheerful and optimistic in all things, he made a good soldier and perhaps a better administrator. If he was neither a statesman nor a military genius, if he believed, for example, that Ireland could have been conquered and held down by eight or ten thousand men, he was a fair tactician and strategist, a first-rate commissariat officer, and an engineer who showed remarkable skill in planting and fortifying permanent posts. He knew also how to govern and to deal kindly with the governed. Above all, he recognised that the true conquest of the provincial lay less in coercion than in civilisation. Many men recognised that truth in his age : it is, indeed, the Roman analogue to the

modern doctrine of 'government by consent.' Agricola was perhaps not even the first to apply it in Britain. But he seems to have applied it effectively, and though we are here concerned with frontiers and fighting, it is fair to notice such a virtue before we pass on.

War against barbarian hill-tribes, such as the natives of northern Britain, when it is a serious war of conquest and not a mere punitive raid, always turns more or less on engineering and commissariat. Forts must be planted in suitable spots and suitably garrisoned, relieved, provisioned; roads must be driven over moorland and mountain, and the whole network of occupation must be maintained, till the wild fierceness of the natives has been worn out or tamed or coaxed into some system of order and obedience. For such a task an Agricola was well fitted—perhaps better fitted than a great military genius or a born ruler of men. Indeed, we shall find that when, not long after Agricola's death, a military genius mounted the Imperial throne, one result (though only an indirect result) of his was to undo the most solid part of Agricola's military achievements.

The Roman method of such conquest was simple. They picked out the principal strategic routes and the natural avenues for traffic in the land which was undergoing 'pacification.' Along those routes and avenues they took their roads, and at convenient distances along these roads—sometimes fifteen or twenty miles but often nearer—they planted forts. These posts were definitely and permanently fortified with ditch and rampart; they stood generally on a low detached hill, or on the edge of rising ground, near the bottom of a valley and the crossing of a stream or river; the garrisons numbered usually 500 men, but sometimes less and not seldom more up to a thousand; the men, as often as not, were three-quarters infantry and one-quarter cavalry; the store of provisions (says Tacitus) was often large enough to last a year. Such posts, self-contained and self-supporting, both maintained peace in their own neighbourhood and secured traffic along the roads. This was the system employed by Agricola, as indeed by all Roman generals throughout the period to which Roman Scotland belongs.

The actual campaigns of Agricola are harder to trace. Tacitus cared little for scientific geography, and by an unlucky chance the few place names that he introduces are almost all unknown. We must turn from literature to archaeology for the little that we can put together. He had, we may safely assert, two bases, the legionary fortress of Chester, on the Dee, and the

legionary fortress of York, on the Ouse. His campaigns seem to have followed sometimes one and sometimes the other of the corresponding west and east coast routes. We trace him, or some Romans of his age, building a post at Carlisle. We can detect him, as it seems, besieging the great hill fortress of Burnswark, which looks over all the Solway plain and half of Cumberland, and drawing round it double lines of entrenchments which recall the greater works of Cæsar at Alesia. We see him, somewhat dimly, moving further north in this direction but deterred by the moors and fells that faced him, and persuaded to abandon the west coast route. But more research is needed, even at Burnswark itself, before we can fill in the picture of his activity in this western region.

Much more is known of his eastern line of march. He, as we may guess, laid out the Roman road which under various names (Leeming Lane, Dere Street and the like*) can still be traced northwards from York to Corbridge on Tyne, and thence to Newstead on Tweed and Inveresk outside of Edinburgh. He built forts along this road; two of them we have described above, a third is at Cappuck on Oxnam Water near Jedburgh, and others remain to be identified. Then, as Tacitus tells us, in his fourth summer campaign he felt his conquests sufficiently assured for permanent annexation, and built a chain of forts from Clota to Bodotria, from Clyde to Forth. One of the forts which formed this chain was, as we have said, at Bar Hill; traces of three others have been detected by Dr. Macdonald and other inquirers at Camelon near Falkirk, at Castle Cary, and at Rough Castle, and the whole line doubtless agreed closely with the later Wall of Pius.

This is the first definitely demarcated frontier between the Roman province and northern Britain. Whether the method of its defence, by a chain of forts, was invented by Agricola, we cannot say. More probably he used the fashion of the time. A year or two later Domitian erected a similar defence on a much larger scale along the Roman-German frontier. There, in the neighbourhood of Wiesbaden and Homburg, he pushed the Roman frontier to the crest of Taunus and lined it with forts—small posts on the actual frontier and larger ones in the rear. In Britain, it will be remembered, the fort of Bar Hill was found to be very small and that of Newstead to be very large. If one can argue from the two examples, the same system may have been used by Agricola as by Domitian in Germany.

From Clyde to Forth is about thirty-five miles, and across

* Modern antiquaries have misnamed it Watling Street.

this narrow isthmus an open natural valley—fit for a modern ship canal—runs from tideway to tideway. Here, where the land between sea and sea is narrow and the hills of northern and southern Scotland divide, Agricola might well have paused. But he was at times an optimist. Just as he undervalued Ireland, so he seems to have thought that northern Scotland would offer little difficulty to his troops. So, after a fifth campaign of uncertain character, in his sixth summer he passed beyond his chain of forts and moved northwards.

Two campaigns, if we read Tacitus aright, were consumed in this furthest warfare, campaigns of which it is vain to fashion any precise topography. Part of the operations seem to have been near the coast, where a fleet acted in union with the army. Part lay along the natural land-route which the Caledonian Railway follows to-day, through the Pass of Stirling and by Dunblane and Perth into Strathmore. Along this route excavations have revealed remains attributable to Agricola on two separate spots. At Ardoch, near Braco, a fort fenced round with huge ditches and earthworks represents a permanent garrison set to guard a Roman road which can still be traced northwards as far as the hill of Gask. At Inchtuthill, yet further north near the confluence of Tay and Isla, a larger camp on a secure and isolated little plateau testifies rather to the temporary needs of one or two campaigns; here we have reason to assert that Agricola's field force camped for a while in a strong strategic position.

Inchtuthill is at present Agricola's farthest recorded north, and naturally enough historians have pounced on the fact. Here or herabouts—so Sir James Ramsay and Professor Oman suggest—he fought that battle of the Graupian Mount which, according to Tacitus, formed the climax alike of his Scottish campaigns and of his active service. The actual site of Mons Graupius is not perhaps a very important matter. It is a literary and not a real battle. No deeds of heroism, no stroke of military genius, no decisive results mark it out as a battle about which the world need care: it owes its fame solely to the rhetoric of Tacitus. The most patriotic Scottish antiquary may sleep contented without knowing where it was fought. But if we ask the material question, how far Agricola and his Romans pushed their way north, then we must remember that Roman 'camps' have been noted west and north of Inchtuthill—one at Comrie in Strathearn, others near Forfar in Strathmore, and one or two yet further north beyond Aberdeen. They are camps, not of permanent occupation but of armies on campaign. They are as yet wholly unexplored; till the

spade has unmasked their secrets, it will be rash to stop Agricola at Inchtuthill on the Tay.

The battle of Mons Graupius was scarcely won when Domitian recalled Agricola. People in Rome wondered if he would obey. But Domitian knew how to control the provincial administration, and the middle-class official, the *peritus obsequi*, was not the man to rebel. His resentment poured itself out on paper, through Tacitus' pen. There it is hot enough. Tacitus could not even bring himself to write in plain words the bitter fact, and he could find no other reason for it than the contrast between Agricola's triumphs in Britain and Domitian's failures elsewhere. Such vindications of retired generals are common in all ages and they are usually as unconvincing as they are common. This is no exception. Tacitus hides the fact that before his recall Agricola had ruled Britain for an unusual span of time. He distorts the fact that in his earlier wars, before Agricola's recall, Domitian did not fail, but fortified an ample stretch of frontier with real success. He omits wholly to remark that Agricola's work in Britain was really finished when he had built his forts from Clyde to Forth, and that further advance could yield no profitable conquest. He omits also that good land was then being won by Rome in Germany, and that troops were sorely needed both on the Rhine and the Danube. Agricola did not leave Britain alone. At the same time some eight or ten thousand men of the Roman garrison were transferred to the continental frontiers. The plain man will conclude that about A.D. 85 the Roman government could balance the needs of its diverse provinces and exact obedience from the most distant of its frontier officials. Let us put that, at least, to the credit of Domitian.

For the next forty years the history of Roman Britain is almost a blank. But where the pen fails, the spade has helped. Researches at Bar Hill seem to show that the line of Clyde and Forth was given up when Agricola went. Researches at Newstead prove that this fort was enlarged and refortified. The inference is obvious. With a reduced army, it seemed best to withdraw from the isthmus—which, though narrow, is easily outflanked—and to hold a southern line along the Tweed. The exact course of this new border is not yet ascertained, but one thing about it is evident. It occupied neither the crest nor the southern slopes but the northern foot of Cheviot. As in other Roman annexations, control of the hills was ensured by occupying both slopes. That was the policy of Augustus when he seized southern Bavaria in order, by pressure from north and south, to tame the Alpine tribes who overlooked Italy.

That was the plan of later Romans, and indeed of recent French in northern Africa. It would have been the policy of our Indian North-west Frontier if the mountains above it were less than half a continent across.

The Tweed remained the Roman limit in Britain for over thirty years. They were years apparently of quiet and peace, and that they ended in disaster was due neither to the Britons nor to the Roman administration of the province, but to the larger policy of the Empire. The soldier-emperor Trajan, whose reign fills the first seventeen years of the second century, broke loose from tradition and plunged into a vigorous forward policy. He fought two great wars. In the first he conquered Dacia, and perhaps it might be said that here he retrieved the *Majubas* and capitulations which had marked the Danube frontier history of Domitian's later years. But we can see now that this is only half the sequel. The Dacian war was no doubt inevitable—at least in the same sense as the South African war a few years ago. But it nearly exhausted the Empire. If Trajan's victory was decisive, his losses were terrific, and he seems to have drained the garrison of Britain, like other provincial garrisons, to meet the need. When his second great war, that in the East, ended in something like defeat and his own death followed, trouble broke out all round. Britain flamed up with the rest. About A.D. 115–20 the northern tribes rose: they swept a legion from the Roman army list for ever, and shook the whole fabric of Roman rule north of the Humber. When, some five years later, Trajan's successor Hadrian came himself to Britain with a fresh legion and other new troops, the far North seemed to him wholly lost. He could do nothing better than choose a frontier forty miles south of Newstead, the line from Tyne to Solway. Thus he gave up a large expanse which had been Roman before Trajan mounted the throne. That is part of the price which the Empire paid for the splendid and costly luxury of a conquering emperor. The memory of Domitian was in some sense avenged when Trajan's wars lost a Domitianic conquest.

If the frontier went back, the fortification of it went forward. Between Tyne and Solway a long continuous valley runs from sea to sea, sundering the outliers of Cheviot on the north from the Pennine hills on the south. It is the shortest line that can be drawn across our island at any point south of the Scottish border, and though it is twice as long as the northern isthmus, it is less easily outflanked. It was probably known to the Romans before Hadrian. Agricola or his successors had no doubt run a road from Corbridge to Carlisle, joining their east

and west coast routes, and they may have guarded this road by forts, though no clear traces survive to-day of either road or forts. But it had not yet been definitely fortified.

To defend this line, Hadrian applied a much more laborious and scientific method than that of Agricola and Domitian. They had built detached forts, strung (as it were) along a road. He, working on old Greek precedents, built a continuous wall from Wallsend on Tyne to Bowness on Solway, guarded it by large and small forts and turrets, and connected the whole by a road. This wall he placed, not, as one might expect, on the southern side of the valley with a slope in front, but on the north side. In this he was influenced, no doubt, by the natural features of the country. The north side which he chose is a nearly continuous ridge of high ground, only twice broken by interrupting rivers, and its central section is singularly well adapted to defence. It is true that much of it, outside this central section, is flat hill-top, which offers no distinct advantages of slope or elevation to the defenders. But to the builder of a continuous wall continuity mattered more than slope or higher ground. Throughout the ancient world, the defence was superior to the attack in all operations affecting fortified positions. The first necessity for Hadrian's Wall was that the defence should be continuous.

The Wall itself has been so much altered and reconstructed by later emperors that little of Hadrian's work can be recognised. In its original form it was, apparently, a solid rampart of neatly-laid sods with a broad ditch in front. It runs, in general, straight, and keeps to the highest ground. But it betrays no over-anxiety on the part of its surveyors as to either point. It rarely deviates from its course to seize a point of vantage: it never preserves that mathematical directness which German scholars have (perhaps rashly) connected with Hadrian's engineering work. Only the central moorland shows another scheme. Here the Wall abandons the straight line wholly for ten miles together: it clings to a series of basalt precipices which face the north and winds from cliff to cliff wherever the slope is sheer and the defence certain. Throughout, it was guarded by forts of varying and uncertain size, and at its western end where the plain of Solway opens out, two or three forts are thrown out northwards while the defence of the Wall itself is slightly weakened. In all its details, it declares itself not a base for a field-force acting to the north of it, still less a starting-place for further conquest, but a barrier. Its garrison's duty was not war but peace. It was a limit of the Roman world.

The barbarians against whom this Wall was drawn were plainly no mean foes. Next to nothing is definitely recorded about the prehistoric hill-tribes of northern Britain. But, if one may judge by the analogy of ancient Ireland, they were neither few nor feeble, and some scanty evidence confirms the parallel. Tacitus notes that they wielded the targe and claymore, and thus sets them beside the later Highlanders, while the multiple ditches and mounds which the Romans set round their forts in Britain, and almost only in Britain, reveal a foe whose charge was very swift and terrible. Eloquent evidence of this is given by a recent discovery in Scotland, which Dr. Macdonald has acutely identified with Agricola. In front of one of his posts he dug a labyrinth of pits, fitted each pit with a hard and pointed stake, covered the whole (as we may think) with leaves or grass, and waited for the Caledonian charge to break itself upon them. Cæsar used such a device at Alesia, and many have since copied it, as lately at Port Arthur. It is a sign of fierce and furious assaults. The Wall was devised against formidable fighters.

It has been asked whether Hadrian did real service to the Empire by this policy of the Wall. He had few troops to dispose of; the garrison of the Wall can at no period have much exceeded fifteen thousand men. Would it not have been better to have massed a mobile field force instead of scattering small units along the frontier? Critics who think so have even called Hadrian the ultimate military reason why the barbarians broke into the Empire two or three centuries later. We cannot agree. Much frontier work is police rather than full-dress war, and a massed army cannot patrol a long line. Even in war a Roman force—mainly infantry, according to the Roman custom—would never have moved so fast as a host of invading barbarians bent on an organised raid. The provisioning of a large force in a desolate land is also no easy thing. The Romans probably understood their own limitations. If for scores of years they followed one frontier system of barrier-walls and forts, we may believe that they knew their own business.

So Hadrian planned about 124 A.D. Not twenty years had passed before a change came. What precise incident or group of incidents caused the change is not recorded; the fact is certain. About 142 the frontier was once more moved northwards. The generals of Hadrian's successor Pius added once more to the Empire the old conquest of Agricola, the land between Tyne and Forth. Corbridge was established as a base, and the old road was reopened which led from it to the Forth; the old forts, Newstead and Bar Hill and others, were rebuilt;

the old frontier from Clyde to Forth was re-occupied, and for its better safety a continuous wall—a device unknown to Agricola—was drawn along it, and outposts were also established or re-established north of this wall. The step apparently cost little trouble. No increase in the army was needed either to win or hold the new posts. Troops were drawn from forts in the now pacified Wales,* and to some extent also from the southern Wall. But we hear of no heavy fighting. Only, to ensure future peace, some thousands of Britons were deported to serve in the Roman forces on the German frontier.

The chief item in the new order is the new feature, the Wall. A continuous rampart was built for thirty-six miles from Old Kilpatrick on the Clyde to Bo'ness on the Forth, along the very line where Agricola had once placed his forts. Its shorter length, its meaner ruins, its less delightful and majestic scenery have won for this Wall far scantier notice than has fallen to the southern Wall. Few, we think, have cared to walk it from end to end: few have gained from it that impression of Roman power which marks the greatest remains of the ancient world. Yet it is a serious piece of frontier work. Like Hadrian's Wall, it was built of sods, and ran along a continuous valley from sea to sea. But it followed to the southern, not the northern, side of the valley, and it made no attempt at straightness; instead, it wound from hill to hill in unceasing anxious quest of strong military positions, and its whole scheme is that of the one central section of Hadrian's Wall which crowns the line of basalt crags. Many forts guarded it, some actually built on to it, others a few yards to the rear. Most of these forts, so far as is known at present, were of one general type. They were girt by ramparts of turf, like the Wall itself; within these ramparts they covered a space equal to a square of a hundred yards, and housed a garrison of five hundred men; they stood on selected sites approximately two miles apart. On the other hand, they were reinforced by no such smaller forts or towers as mark the lines of Hadrian. The garrisons of the northern Wall were perhaps stronger; they were certainly massed closer than those of the south.

It is not clear, however, that the system was worked out quite so mathematically as the preceding paragraph may seem to imply. One fort, certainly, was quite small. Another

* Details of Roman military remains in Wales may be found in the 'Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion' for 1908-9. We mention this because Professor J. E. Lloyd in his excellent history of early Wales has apparently overlooked it.

which occupied a strategic point was larger than the rest, and walled with stone instead of turf, and garrisoned in double strength. Nor is it quite certain that the two-mile interval was always observed. Much as recent excavations have revealed, much as Dr. Macdonald has widened knowledge, no one yet knows exactly how many forts there were. Ten, says Dr. Macdonald, are certain; six more are fairly certain, and three are probable but unproven. Other inquirers might slightly vary the probabilities. To us it seems that there exist on the line of the Wall four stretches, each of some four miles long, within which no fort has yet been detected. In these sections, or in some of them, it is conceivable that forts were not thought needful. One instance will show, however, how hard the problem at present is. The little town of Kirkintilloch lies nearly midway between two fairly certain forts, a mile and three-quarters from one and two miles and a half from the other. Its pride is a famous earthwork called the Peel, which stands on a site well suited to a Roman fort and which an immemorial tradition declares to have once been such a fort. The other day a formal proposal was made to record on the Coronation monument of Kirkintilloch 'the Roman fort and the legion which came there direct from the siege of Jerusalem.' The legion is in any case mythical, but that need not condemn the fort. Now Dr. Macdonald after prolonged inquiries has to admit that nothing Roman has ever been recorded from the site except the handle of one jar and a few coins. There, for the moment, the matter rests. But a few pounds spent on spadework would do more to clear up the history of Kirkintilloch than a score of Coronation monuments.

The Wall was reinforced by outposts north of it. These outposts have not yet found their Macdonald, and they serve at present mainly to provoke curiosity. That the Ardoch fort, founded by Agricola, should now be rebuilt, is intelligible. That a fort of this period should be traceable north-east of the Ochils requires some explanation. Yet the remains still visible in the policies of Carpow, near Abernethy, seem to show that such a fort existed. Coeval with the Wall the garrison of a permanent Roman post looked out on the waters of the Firth of Tay.

This new frontier did not supersede the earlier, southern line. The two were held together. Possibly the southern garrisons were reduced; some of them, or portions of them, were certainly moved up to the front. But the southern forts were not left empty, and perhaps this fact gives us the best clue to the real intentions of Pius. He did not aim at

annexing part of southern Scotland to the Empire. When he stretched out a long arm and gripped the isthmus and even laid a finger on the Tay, he did not gather, or mean to gather, in his embrace the land he seized. He took not a new province, but a remote strategic point, a Clitral or a Gilgit. He closed the door by which the unconquered Caledonians, descending from their hills, could pour into southern Scotland, whether to steal arms and cattle and worry garrisons, or to carry organised raids right down to British lands and to make the Britons rise. For this end it was necessary to hold the isthmus and perhaps some points beyond it. It was not necessary to spread Roman permanent posts over all southern Scotland. Wales and northern Britain were held down by networks of forts and roads : no such feature meets us beyond Hadrian's Wall. The road was reopened which Agricola had made past Newstead to the Forth and the west end of the Wall ; possibly another road was carried from Carlisle past Carstairs to the centre of the Wall. But all the land west of this latter line lay wholly outside the Roman strategy. So far as we know, no Roman ever entered it ; the Roman 'baths' and 'roads' and 'bridges' which the Scottish antiquaries and the Scottish Ordnance Survey have found in, for example, Galloway and Ayrshire, are mere unfortunate inventions.

The strategic scheme of Pius was ingenious and forcible, but it was conceived in too sanguine a spirit. The hundred and fifty miles of road and frontier from Corbridge to the Forth and thence along the Wall required for its maintenance either a large garrison or peace alike on its western flank and on its base, the Wall of Hadrian. The peace was brief. The Britons down in the south of the island were now growing Romanised and the tribes of the Welsh hills, if yet uncivilised, were docile. The northern Britons were still unsoftened. They did not easily turn even into 'friendlies' or accept any form of Roman protectorate. They fought on. About 155-8 the whole country rose from the Derbyshire hills to Cheviot or beyond, and the revolt was hardly checked by hurrying reinforcements oversea from Germany to the Tyne. They rose again—or perhaps they were still in the field—about 162, and a special commander had to be sent against them. Somewhere in this wild fighting the Wall of Pius, it seems, was lost for a while ; Newstead also was stormed and destroyed, and several regiments vanished from the Roman army. Peace was at last restored and the lost forts recovered. But increasing troubles on the Danube took up all the strength of Rome ; the much-needed increase in the British army was deferred. The inevitable

followed. Fifteen years after the last mentioned rising a new and worse revolt broke out, as Commodus was mounting the throne. Again a special officer was sent out. Ancient writers record a victory: Commodus in 184 took the triumphal name *Britannicus*. The victory may have restored northern England to obedience; for all beyond that, it was a paper triumph. This was the end of Roman Scotland. Statistics of the Roman coins found north of Cheviot show that the dominion begun by Pius about 142 now, after forty troubled years, reached its conclusion. In the chaos of Commodus' misrule and the civil wars attendant on his assassination, it became even doubtful whether northern England could be held.

One more act remains in the restless drama of Caledonia. When the civil wars were ended, and the ablest and most ruthless of the pretenders, Septimius Severus, ruled alone, he came, like Hadrian before him, to order the British frontier in person. He was old and ill. But his savage and indomitable vigour carried him through two campaigns; as a third year opened, he died at York. The details of his activity are obscure. To his own age, if we may judge by a later abridgement of a contemporary historian, his deeds in Britain seemed something portentous and prodigious, outside the scope of human action and inspired by an unnatural strength and fierceness. Though he suffered 'unspeakable things,' though tempestuous rains stayed his marches, and the natives, always refusing battle, cut off his outposts and stragglers daily, though he lost fifty thousand men, he forced his way (we read) into the farthest north, almost to the end of the island, and extorted from the Caledonians a surrender of no small territory. It is hard to build history out of melodrama. No Roman site in Scotland, save possibly the vicinity of Edinburgh, shows any vestige of Severus. Newstead, for example, and the forts on the Wall, were all lost about 180, and Roman feet never trod in them again. Curiously enough, however, there have been found on chance spots in the counties of Fife, Kinross and Kincardine, though nowhere else in Scotland, Roman coins which might be connected with Severus. If a guess must be made, we might ask whether he sailed round to the Firth of Forth, marched thence across Kinross and followed the east coast northwards, there entrenching some of those encampments which we have already mentioned as existing in and beyond Forfarshire. The alternative is to think that he never got beyond the Cheviots.

His most lasting work was done south of Cheviot. His Scottish conquests, whatever they were, perished with him. But on the southern isthmus between Tyne and Solway a

measure was carried out which later ages ascribe to him. This was the rebuilding of Hadrian's Wall. The original line, the original ditch in front of the old Wall were retained, except at one point ; the turf rampart was rebuilt in stone, the forts were walled with stone, and many of them enlarged to hold garrisons a thousand strong ; and the defence was reorganised on the tactical principle of posting such units four or five miles apart, instead of the smaller unit at a smaller distance which we met on the walls of Pius. Thus Hadrian's Wall arose again as a new-built stronger barrier. It is not easy on our imperfect information to fit this measure into a policy of Scottish invasion. But the statements of our ancient authorities are plain and allow no other reasonable interpretation. We may perhaps put two and two together, and suppose that the measures of Severus included two things. He recovered territory from the natives and re-established Hadrian's Wall : he also carried far into Caledonia a punitive raid, which should declare to all the natives the power of the Empire.

With his death in 211 Scotland drops out of the tale of the British frontier. For the next three or four generations the border was apparently north of the Wall, following the range of Cheviot. The southern half of Dere Street, which runs north from Corbridge, was still held by the Romans, and two forts on it were still garrisoned. One was

‘The moated mound of Risingham,
Where Reed upon her margin sees
Sweet Woodburn's cottages and trees,’

the other a lonelier post amid the moors at Rochester. The hills which ever since about 1242 have formed the boundary of England and Scotland were the boundary also for seventy or eighty years in the third century. Risingham indeed has yielded an early Christian tombstone, which is among the latest Roman monuments of Northumberland. With the fourth century this transmural area was lost. But still the obstinate defence of the Wall went on. It has even been supposed by some modern writers that somewhere about 369 the land between the two Walls was for a moment recovered and formed into a shadowy province Valentia. The supposition is pretty certainly wrong, but the mere fact that it should be made is significant.

The end came with the end of the century. As we have seen, there were still men in Roman Corbridge to hide gold coins about A.D. 385 : the latest coins found anywhere on or near Hadrian's Wall are but little later than this. The Scots were now pouring from Ireland into Caledonia, and giving it its new name ; other

Irish were plundering in the south ; the English had been vexing the eastern coasts of Britain for fifty years and more. Finally, on the winter's night which divided 406 and 407 a barbarian host broke down the Roman frontier of Gaul and rent the Western world into fragments. Britain was cut off from Rome. The British *limes* had lasted as long as the Roman Empire in Britain. It was time for it to cease.

No Empire has left so great a name as Rome. None has so thoroughly conquered its conquerors and set its mark on the memory of succeeding generations. The *limes* ceased. But it was not forgotten. The Britons of the sixth or seventh century looked back to it and to the power which reared it, and told strange stories of its origin and rebuildings and destruction. Instinctively men knew what the Roman frontier system had done for them. It is not likely that any modern nation will soon again stand in the place that Rome then held. Our culture to-day is firmly planted in three continents, and the task of our modern empires is rather to diffuse it than to defend it. But the Roman Empire was the civilised world, and its safety the safeguarding of all civilisation. Outside was the wild chaos of barbarism, ever pressing closer and closer in. Rome kept it back, not in Britain only, but from end to end of Europe and across western Asia. Through all the swallowing waves of barbarian onset, through the carnage of uncounted wars, through plague and discord that brought whole generations down to the dust of a disastrous death, the work went on. The men who upheld the defence were not, for the most part, statesmen or generals of supreme insight or skill or intelligence. Their successes were those of character, not of genius. But their phlegmatic courage and endurance saved the law and order and civilised life of Europe till the assailants had realised their worth. When the frontier fell at last, after two hundred years' defence, the victors came to learn, not to destroy.

The Roman Empire has left few marks on Scotland. One road which the Romans built, the Dere Street which we have already mentioned, can still be traced through Roxburghshire. The Cheviot shepherd knows well the Roman track by Makendon and Thirlmoor, and for some miles on either side of Monteviot it forms a modern roadway. Scott wrote good history (though not perhaps very good geography) when William of Deloraine came in his ride to where

'Broad on the left before him lay
For many a mile the Roman way.'

The road did not run exactly where the poet thought. But it was a real road. Along it, on the morrow of Otterburn, the Scots carried the dead Douglas from the field where he fell to his grave in Melrose. Along it, in less poetic days, many a bold borderer has smuggled salt or whisky into England. But that is almost the single inheritance which has come down to the life and culture of modern Scotland from the Roman *times*. Neither the towns nor the country life of Scotland, nor Scottish thought and intellect, owe anything to it, much as they owe to Rome in other ways. The Roman walls in Scotland and northern England have passed utterly out of our modern lives. They did not, in the end, save Roman civilisation in our corner of the empire. But before they perished they helped to do a work for which to-day all Europe may be grateful.

ART. X.—THE DUCHESSE DU MAINE AND HER COURT.

La Duchesse du Maine, Reine de Sceaux et Conspiratrice (1676-1753). Par LE GÉNÉRAL DE PIÉPAPE. Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1910.

IN a description of the society of the early part of the eighteenth century in France any mention of the Duchesse du Maine must always excite a desire for a more intimate knowledge of a lady who in her time wielded so much power, a desire which has recently been gratified by General de Piépape in the exhaustive work cited at the head of this article.

On more than one account Madame du Maine commands attention. By birth a Princess of the blood, she was one of the chief figures in a political conspiracy which aimed at the fall of the Duc d'Orléans and at the rise of the Duc du Maine, and in aid of which the interference of Spain in French internal affairs was invoked. The idea of intriguing with a foreign Power for the satisfaction of private ambition and animosity was not a lofty aim, but in this affair and in other ways, notwithstanding limitations, exaggerations, and eccentricities, Madame du Maine proved that she possessed a large share of the pride and courage and love of dominion which characterised the century in which she was born, and the royal house of which she was a member.

This same intriguing Princess brought together a unique coterie which connects her name with celebrated and influential men and women of her day, so that she forms a notable intermediary between two contrasting epochs—the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Unmindful of obligation to her blood and rank, she attached herself to some who were leaders in the revolutionary ideas directed against royalty and her order, and she showed, also, not a little liberality in regard to individual morality—as was to be expected in a leader of the society of that age. It is pleasant, however, to record, when accused of so much in the way of revolt, that there was no scandalous side in the private life of Madame du Maine, though it must be admitted that she was woefully neglectful of husband and children. She did not hesitate to call to her side such notorious iconoclasts—moral and political—as Voltaire, together with his mistress, the Marquise du Châtelet, Madame du Defland and President Hénault, d'Alembert, and others wise and witty, but against whom much could be

said by the adherents of established convention, as well as by friends of the monarchical institution.

Born on November 8, 1676, Madame du Maine lived in a changing and difficult period, and the struggle between the pride and prejudice of the old time and the rash receptiveness of the new was to some degree personified in her complex career.

The House of Bourbon and the French Monarchy together reached the height of their power in the reign of Louis XIV., and in his latter days, true to the law of rise and decline which acts irrespective of persons or of their products, the man, the family, and the Monarchy had together begun visibly to fail. It was then, when Madame de Maintenon was ruling supreme over King and Court, that Anne Louise Bénédicte de Bourbon-Condé, known up to her marriage with the Duc du Maine as Mademoiselle de Charolais, entered upon the scene.

The signs of degeneracy were plainly visible in the line of the Bourbon-Condé in the person of her father, Henri Jules, Prince de Condé, the son of the 'Grand Condé.' The line of Condé separated from the ruling branch with the father of Henri IV.—the grandfather of Henri IV. being the common ancestor of the Duc and Duchesse du Maine. Though the strain had deteriorated, Mademoiselle de Charolais had inherited her grandfather's type of mind, and many of the most characteristic qualities of that old noble had descended to her—his energy and his love of battle, his appreciation of scholars and of scholarship. We are reminded of him in her political tergiversations, while from her grand-aunt, the daring Duchesse de Longueville, the little Princess may have acquired a taste for political plotting.

She did not resemble these forebears, however—both of whom were remarkable for their beauty—in appearance, but took after her father, who, like his ill-treated mother, Claire Clémence de Maillé Brézé, Richelieu's unfortunate niece, was undersized and badly formed. Perhaps it was to distinguish him from his father, 'le héros,' 'le grand Condé,' that the son was called 'le Prince tout court.' His children were still less in stature, so that their grandfather feared that his race would soon entirely disappear, declaring, wittily: 'Si ma race 'diminue toujours ainsi, elle viendra à rien!' 'Les poupées du 'sang!' was another of the sayings to which the diminutive size of Mademoiselle de Charolais and her sisters gave rise which may have hurt their feelings.

It is true that Mademoiselle de Charolais was small in stature

and that she was not beautiful. Neither was she lovely in character, but she was clever, and she had that lively and intelligent expression which is ever attractive, so that she was able to please when she took the trouble. And in her rebellious person was incarnated all the restless spirit of the age. She had a craving for continual excitement, a state of mind which, once her own mistress, she did her best to satisfy.

Mademoiselle de Charolais was not happy at home. Her father's tyranny was such that his wife and children led a miserable existence, entirely subject to his uncontrolled temper, which finally developed into madness. The gentle Bavarian Princess whom he had married was, fortunately for the welfare of the family, the opposite to her husband in all things, and she found what consolation she could in her unhappy lot in her children. No pains were spared in their education, and the third daughter, Mademoiselle de Charolais, whose exceptional gifts were early shown, was given the same tuition as her brother, and by no less a man than La Bruyère. That the young girl would submit to no such fate as that borne by her mother and grandmother was soon evident, for she was as ungovernable and as despotic as either her father or grandfather. But she was freed at an early age from the odious thralldom suffered at the Hôtel de Condé and at Chantilly.

The Prince was not entirely devoid of the qualities of his race. He was a brave soldier, and had saved his father's life at Senef, but his ambitions had now dwindled to those petty, personal aims common to courtiers, and his only thought for his children lay in the direction of the Court. Alliances, therefore, which would bring them as near as might be to the throne were sought, regardless of any stain on the escutcheon of the children of its occupant. His only son was married early to Mademoiselle de Nantes, the daughter of the King and Madame de Montespan, and Mademoiselle de Charolais was betrothed, at the age of six, to the Comte de Vermandois, the son of the King and Madame de la Vallière. The early death of the Count put an end to this arrangement, but six years later the Prince was assisted to the realisation of a similar arrangement by that most powerful of allies, Madame de Maintenon.

We are told that Louis XIV. was first attracted to Madame de Maintenon by her devotion to his children. Its sincerity was unquestionable, and the feeling they inspired was the warmest passion she ever experienced. Among them the Duc du Maine was the one to whom each was partial, and the one whose equivocal position caused them the most concern. Madame de Maintenon, fearful of his future in the event of the

King's death, was desirous above all things to see him established in a more assured position, and was seeking a bride with this object in view. There could be no better alliance in such a case than that offered by a Princess of the blood, one which, even, by uniting the two branches of the family, furnished scope for the most ambitious dreams.

The daughter of the Duc d'Orléans was the first to be considered, but Madame de Maintenon here encountered the violent opposition of the King's sister-in-law, the Princess Palatine, who, indeed, opposed any project with which Madame de Maintenon had to do. Next, she turned to the younger branch of the family and approached the Prince de Condé, where, one may be sure, her path was made smooth. She then persuaded the King—against his better judgement—that his children born out of wedlock might be raised into a position on an equality with his legitimate offspring, and he himself visited the Princess to ask the hand of Mademoiselle de Charolais for the Duc du Maine.

The person or disposition of a marriageable Princess does not much matter, and the three daughters of the House of Condé were most desirable from every other point of view. Nevertheless, the second daughter was now overlooked—and she died from the shame of it—because she was the tiniest even of the three. The eldest had already made a satisfactory marriage with her cousin, François Louis de Conti, and so to the third daughter, Mademoiselle de Charolais, fell the coveted bridegroom.

The marriage was solemnised on March 19, 1692: the bride was sixteen, the bridegroom twenty-two. The marriage portion of each was princely. The young husband was the favourite child of the most powerful monarch in Christendom. All auguries seemed to promise security and happiness. But the developement of character can never with certainty be foretold, and Madame de Maintenon was given occasion—and soon—for disappointment in the bride she had chosen.

No husband and wife could well be more unlike or less suited to one another than the Duc and the Duchesse du Maine. Piously reared by Madame de Maintenon, the Duke, docile and well-intentioned, was a religious devotee; but there was neither emotion nor mysticism in the composition of the young Duchess, who, imbued with the new philosophical ideas, was drifting farther and farther away from the practices of the Church. But faith and the feminine attributes of modesty and gentleness, which were lacking in the wife, the husband possessed. In short, he had heart, while she was gifted in mind alone. As

a child, the Duke had been weak in health and lame. Saint-Simon—always his detractor—calls him deformed, but, thanks to the indefatigable care of Madame de Maintenon, he had developed into a healthy and pleasing though timid and reserved youth—the very antithesis of his wife. One affinity there was, and one only, to draw them together. This was a common love of letters, and several works by the Duke, for the most part maxims religious or moral, show alike his literary leanings and the influence of Madame de Maintenon.

The grief and chagrin of this lady will be understood when she discovered that the doll was stuffed with sawdust—for so it must have struck her ascetic sense, as the want of religious feeling in the young Duchess became more and more marked; and in a letter to Madame de Brinon, her assistant at Saint-Cyr, she complained that she had therein been deceived.

'J'ai un chapitre à traiter avec vous,' she wrote, 'qui est celui de Madame la Duchesse du Maine. Vous m'avez trompée sur son sujet dans l'article principal qui est celui de la piété: elle n'a *veine qui y tende*, et veut faire en tout comme les autres. Je n'oserais rien dire à une jeune princesse élevée par la vertu même; je ne voudrais point la faire dévote de profession; mais j'avoue que j'aurais bien voulu la voir régulière, prendre un train de vie qui seroit agréable à Dieu, au Roi, et à Monsieur le Duc du Maine, qui a assez de bon sens pour vouloir sa femme plus sage que certaines autres. Je lui avois donné une dame d'honneur qui est une sainte; mais il paraît qu'elle est peu autorisée, et ne fait que la suivre. Elle est enfant. Elle auroit plus besoin d'une gouvernante que d'une dame.' *

But, in spite of disillusion on the score of religion, the Duke's fond friend was still ready and anxious to love his wife, as is proved in the same letter:

'Du reste,' she continued, 'elle est telle que vous me l'avez dépeinte: jolie, aimable, gaie, spirituelle, et pardessus tout cela, aime fort son mari, qui, de son côté, l'aime passionnément, et la gâtera plutôt que de lui faire la moindre peine. . . . J'avoue que je voudrois aimer la Duchesse du Maine pardessus tout, étant ce qu'elle est à un homme qui est la tendresse de mon cœur.' *

Sad to relate, as time went on there proved to be even less community of thought and feeling between the Duchess and Madame de Maintenon than between the Duchess and her husband. Madame du Maine was bent on pleasure to an inordinate degree, and were her freaks and fancies for a moment

* 'La Duchesse du Maine,' par Le Général de Piépape, page 23.

threatened, she would fly into such a passion that, mindful of the mental aberrations of her father, the Duke gave his wife her own way, no matter how much ridicule that way might call down upon both.

And other difficulties arose. The marriage, which had been celebrated with a splendour and display unusual even for Princes, had aroused on either side of the family a jealousy which never ceased to exist and which was manifested in increasing ill-will. The Duchess, as by this time will well be understood, was not one to be patient under any show of disdain or want of consideration; so without delay she set to work to conquer a position for themselves which would place them above innuendoes in respect to their rank and rights. Ungovernable and unconquerable, her unceasing complaints were finally heeded by the King, and a bill providing a degree between that of the peers and the legitimate Princes was passed by the Parliament for their benefit.

The Duke was well pleased. Not so the Duchess, whom no act would have satisfied short of one which would bestow the rights and honours in full possessed by the legitimate Princes, and she did not hesitate to signify her discontent, abruptly absenting herself from all Court functions, and immuring herself in her private apartments. Hardly the character, however, to live the life of a hermit, she soon turned from one excess to another, from mad pleasures to the most serious and arduous study, throwing into it all that vehemence and energy formerly given to amusements. La Bruyère again became her guide, to whom was added the Duke's former preceptor, Malézieu. In her own rooms, also, were received other savants and men of letters, and this short interval, the prelude to the literary distractions at Châtenay, Sceaux and Anet, was the period when, assisted by a remarkable memory, she gained her considerable knowledge of science and literature. But withdrawal from the gay world, and all that it might have signified, was of short duration.

The Duke's letters-patent, secured through his wife's efforts, were registered in May 1694, but before the year was out the Duchess, now more than ever impatient of surveillance and restraint, had persuaded her husband to forsake the royal roof and to take up their abode elsewhere, and in the meantime her former giddy life had been resumed and with increased extravagance.

Undue gaiety at the Court of Louis XIV. under the strict discipline of Madame de Maintenon was not countenanced, and the Duchess's expenditure, which threatened to be ruinous,

at last brought a warning from the King. In addition, it was the Duke's misfortune to be continually reminded by his wife how much he had gained by his marriage with a Princess of the blood, and how much she had lost in allying herself with a man who had no claim to birth at all. It is not surprising, therefore, that he soon found it convenient to absent himself, taking up his command on the frontier, a post for which, peaceable-minded and studious, he had small natural inclination. In such manner was spent the first years of their marriage.

No doubt the primal cause of the youthful Duchess's vagaries and waywardness was an incurable disappointment in regard to her marriage. It was only after marriage that she realised the true status of the illegitimate children of the King, and holding opposite views to her father, she henceforth looked upon her marriage as a *mésalliance*. Of harder fibre than her husband, she no longer pretended to any respect for him, and in after years showed few marks of tenderness for him or for her children.

When, in the second year of their marriage, Madame de Montespan proposed to her son that he and his wife should occupy the château of Clagny, the magnificent residence at the gates of Versailles, built expressly for her by the King, the Duchess was eager to seize the opportunity of freedom thus offered, and here, the five following years, the ill-assorted pair nominally made their home. Here the Duke suffered a painful shock, for the Duchess poorly requited the hospitality of Madame de Montespan, and it was his strange fate to be the witness of his mother's final disgrace and banishment from her home, effected through the efforts of his wife and of the woman who was his oldest and his best friend. He no longer cared to inhabit Clagny; his wife was dissatisfied too, from its proximity to the Court, and in 1699 Seeaux was purchased. Five years again, while this grand domain was in course of transformation, were spent near Seeaux at Châtenay in a house belonging to Malézieu, and in this modest domicile, set in the hillside village prettily embowered in vines and fruit trees, Madame du Maine probably passed her happiest years.

Twelve kilomètres from Paris, Châtenay was also well removed from the Court, and here was found that which she needs must have—and to which most intelligent persons must aspire—independence. Never before had she been so well satisfied with her lot, by reason of which the Duke on his side enjoyed unwonted domestic tranquillity.

The first visit to Châtenay was of short duration, but the next year the house was put into shape for their regular occu-

pancy, and here their two sons, the Prince des Dombes and the Comte d'Eu, were born.

The celebrated circle of *grands seigneurs* and *bels esprits* which Madame du Maine attracted to Sceaux and to Anet, and which is her chief claim to remembrance in these days, had its début at Châtenay. This so-called 'Court' filled a double function, combining the personnel and occupations common to a Court with those proper to a literary salon. It existed throughout the first half of the century over the long period of fifty years, the first which was divided into two distinct periods, that before the arrest and imprisonment of Monsieur and Madame du Maine on December 29, 1718; the second, from which politics were eliminated—and when old friends were to some extent superseded by new—having still no little in common with the first.

Throughout the first part the predominant figure is Malézieu.

The name of Nicolas de Malézieu is now less often heard than those of others who in that day had less reputation. A member of the French Academy and of the Academy of Sciences, *savant* and *bel esprit*, he was also a man of most amiable disposition and of many friends; he, and he alone, it was said, was able to bring about a reconciliation between Fénelon and Bossuet. For more than twenty-five years Malézieu was at hand to supply Madame du Maine with that endless procession of changing amusements and intellectual pursuits demanded by her restless and insatiable nature, and it was Malézieu she had chiefly to thank for the *éclat* her Court enjoyed. That the great households of the period found it pleasant and useful to have *beaux esprits* attached to them may be readily perceived, but it is less easy to understand how such an occupation could be congenial to a scholar. We have to recollect that the eighteenth century was a period which, in its vivid contrasts and in its extremes, both good and bad, has no counterpart in history, and that this quixotic age provides many instances of singular friendships and of similar devotion between clever men and women. One may take, for example, the well-known affectionate relations which existed between Madame du Deffand and Horace Walpole, so many years her junior; and so again, in the close and long intercourse between Malézieu and Madame du Maine may be seen at work that spirit peculiar to the time, which drew men and women more familiarly together intellectually in platonic friendships than at any other period. And the lasting and helpful nature of this social feature which the eighteenth century evoked is thrown into stronger relief by the light

and ephemeral character of the love-making of the time, equally a feature of the age.

As Malézieu had assisted in Madame du Maine's intellectual development, he looked upon her attainments, no doubt, as primarily his own product, and upon her and her career with the sympathy and interest natural to the master who sees his pupil respond to his efforts.

As to her husband, his piteous plight anticipated that of another unfortunate husband of a well-known ruler of a later salon, Madame Geoffrin, of whom a constant visitor, pointing out Monsieur Geoffrin, inquired his name!

Possessed of such an amenable husband and such a capable friend, even the disappointed and egotistical Duchess, one might think, could now have congratulated herself as a woman favoured of fortune. But circumstances do not alter the nature of individuals. With a brilliant intellect, this singular woman had none of the strength and solidity which forms the groundwork of a thoughtful mind, and which tends to create serenity of spirit. She did not love study for its own sake: to be diverted was her aim, and the diversions required by her must be at once amusing and clever. Malézieu, hard pressed, sought a coadjutor among his academical confrères to assist him in this double task, and it was the clergy which produced the Court jester.

The Abbé Genest, ex-chaplain of the Duchesse d'Orléans, was one among the large number of those accomplished and epicurean abbés who flourished in this period—degenerate products of a decadent Church—a man risen from below, whose character was not equal to his brains. The abbé mingled much learning with little piety, living a life of mere pleasure, but many and witty were the couplets improvised by him for Madame du Maine and her company, and his success was instantaneous. The abbé was the fortunate possessor of a prominent nose—fortunate as it gave opportunity to the Duchess to play upon his name, which was immediately changed from Genest to Large Nez. Anything but sensitive, such a man furnished a mark for her wit, and between Large Nez and Malézieu a dull moment was never suffered at Châtenay.

Novel amusements were constantly in course of preparation by the indefatigable pair. Marvellous fireworks were invented, and the enchanted villagers, in the happy fashion of pre-Revolutionary days, joined them in rustic dances, and before these simple pastimes were permitted to pall entertainments on a magnificent scale were organised. Of one of these, given on August 16, 1704, we have a detailed description.

The chief feature was a play written by Madame du Maine expressly for Malézieu, who took the leading part. The prologue was by Genest. The music for the ballet which accompanied the play was composed by Matho, the Court musician at Versailles, and was performed by an orchestra of thirty-five pieces. The villagers had appropriate parts, and the piece was given in a tent which seated more than three hundred spectators. After the play the company supped and danced till daylight.

Again, we read of an extraordinary scene when a collation presided over by the Duchess was prepared in a hall lined with fresh foliage to simulate a woodland scene, and when the serving men were disguised as fauns.

All mythology was ransacked for subjects for these splendid festivals, and the occupants of Châtenay, as it were by the wave of a wand, were changed into nymphs, dryads, and divinities, enchanters, gnomes, fairies, tiniest elves, and gigantic Cyclops. Out of compliment to the châtelaine's scientific acquirements the place was peopled also with a multitude of astronomical figures and constellations, and single celestial bodies revolved about the small yet commanding figure of her who to them represented the pole star, the centre of their universe.

As many ridiculous devices of divers sorts as a lively fancy could conceive were employed to gratify that love of amusement which must be satisfied at any cost. Thus on one occasion animated ninepins stood in ranks, or toppled over at will. Another time the card players were suitably arrayed as Queen of Hearts, King of Clubs, Jack of Spades, etc., and the success of each and every fantasy was assured by the presence of the best dancers of the Royal Academy, while recitations in verse, after the manner of the following composition by the hostess, gave a literary and classic turn to the entire conception :

‘Avec sa lyre,
Quand Nevers* chante dans nos bois,
Il n’est point de cœurs qu’il n’attire,
Comme fit Orphée autrefois,
Avec sa lyre.’

This mixture of folly and intellect, though exhibited in an exceptional degree at Châtenay and Sceaux, must not be thought to be a combination peculiar to the coterie of which we are writing. It was only a somewhat excessive ebullition

* The duc de Nevers.

of that curious mingling of the serious and light, the grave and gay, for which the eighteenth century is unique.

It was at Châtenay that Madame du Maine evolved the much talked of and imitated institution—a mock pattern of the chivalric orders—the order of the ‘*Mouche à Miel*.’ The order and the name had their origin in the appropriate device taken by the Duchess before she left Versailles, a bee encircled by the line from Tasso, ‘*Piccola sì, ma fa può gravi li ferite.*’ A warning to be heeded, as advised by Malézieu :—

‘*L’abeille, petit animal,
Fait de grandes blessures,
Craignez son aiguillon fatal,
Evitez ses piqures.
Fuyez, si vous pouvez, les traits
Qui partent de sa bouche ;
Elle pique et s’envole après.
C’est une fine mouche.*’

Ludovise—the name adopted by the Duchess as Queen of the Bees—presided over the meetings of the order, a golden wand in hand and seated on a throne hung with blue velvet embroidered with bees in silver. At the ceremony of initiation the novice must swear fidelity not only to the order and its members, but to the pursuit of pleasure, and as many impossible questions as could be invented were put to embarrass him and to amuse his tormentors. At the end the new member was invested with a gold medal bearing the likeness of the Queen.

Secaux was purchased by the Duc du Maine in 1699, the year in which the Duchess paid her first visit to Châtenay; but it was not until 1704 that we find her installed on her own property, the first that she could call her own home. Though now despoiled and dismantled, the magnificent domain may yet, in a measure, be reconstructed from the prints of the period and from that which we know of its history.

The barony of Secaux covered a large extent of territory comprising also Châtenay, Plessis Piquet, and Châtillon. The palace, originally built in 1597 in the severely simple lines of seventeenth-century construction, had been altered and enlarged by Colbert, who made it one of the most splendid and ornate residences in the kingdom. Claude Perrault, the designer of the colonnade of the Louvre, had overseen its reconstruction, and Le Brun had decorated the interior. Colbert, on the death of his eldest son, the Marquis de Seignelay, who had occupied it, was glad to find a purchaser in the Duc du Maine, and the new owner proceeded still further with

improvements and embellishments. Le Nôtre had been the presiding genius at Sceaux, and the ornamental waters, the parterres and sculptures, also on a grand scale, recalled his splendid creations at Versailles. Under the new châtelaine we are told that architects and painters were bidden to Sceaux, that the statues were multiplied in the park, and that an army of skilled workmen were drawn hither by the extent and importance of the changes involved, the descendants of whom have lived there to this day. Madame du Maine lived before the school of eighteenth-century painting had made much progress, but she inspired the last work of the painters Le Brun and Mignard, the sculptor Coysevox, and other surviving artists of a more restrained period. She had no leanings towards the voluptuous, and she would never have patronised a Boucher.

The preparations for their occupancy, which had called forth such vast expenditure of money, labour and brains, were at length completed, and Madame du Maine entered into possession of what must have appeared to be the promised land.

A magnificent avenue, 'La Diane,' made an appropriate approach to the palace, before which it formed a half-circle. Terraces following the same curved line led to the park below, and the forest which then covered so much of the country thereabout terminated the prospect. Another façade commanded a view, equally extensive, overlooking the fertile valley of Châtenay, where shone the winding waters of the Bièvre. The style of the period, when the intermingling of art and nature was utilised in producing grand effects, was throughout maintained. The main structure comprised five pavilions with ornamented façades and mansard roofs, and set in an environment of brilliant flowers arranged in symmetrical forms, of soft verdure on which white marbles gleamed, of falling cascades and splashing fountains, composed a scene which must have struck a spectator of the time as the extreme of beauty and of grandeur.

The entrance to the principal court, or 'Cour d'honneur,' which was preceded by another court, was reserved for the carriages of the King and the Princes of the blood, and the state and ceremony due to the position of the occupants of the palace were provided for in every particular. Now, too, Madame du Maine's accustomed pleasant means of employing her time was given opportunity of expansion.

In one of the gardens stood a building of elegant proportions and richly decorated in the classical style, the 'Pavillon de l'Aurore,' so called from a fresco by Le Brun which ornamented

the ceiling of the cupola. This was Madame du Maine's pleasure-house, the appropriate theatre for the allegorical fêtes of which she was so deeply enamoured.

'Malgré ma superbe structure,
Le temps, tyran de la nature,
Ebranlera mes fondements;
Mais ma mémoire, consacrée
Par vos nobles amusements,
Sera d'éternelle durée.'

This prophecy relative to the 'Pavillon de l'Aurore,' made by Malézieu, has not yet been fulfilled. The Revolution left it intact, and though its beautiful carved wood was destroyed by the vandalism of the Prussians in the war of 1870, the pavilion may yet be seen, still adorned by Le Brun's charming fresco.

The wisdom born of experience may now be remarked in the more careful conduct of Madame du Maine. She was twenty-five when she took up her residence at Seeaux, and it began to dawn upon her that to hold a society together even a princess must learn to curb her whims and vagaries, that self-control is essential to success in any career, and something of this wholesome realising sense was made manifest not only to her habitués but to the members of her household.

Of those who formed it no one was so remarkable as Rose de Launay, afterwards Madame de Staal, the accomplished companion and confidante, an interesting and oftentimes pathetic figure who enters upon the scene at Seeaux in striking contrast to her wilful and imperious mistress. Her lifelong service with Madame du Maine was commenced in the humble capacity of *femme de chambre*, and her 'Mémoires,' frank as they are in regard to the exigent character of her mistress, yet bear witness to a considerable patience and consideration on that mistress's part. A knowledge of science and literature had not equipped the young woman for the position to which she was at first assigned, and being short-sighted, many awkward and ridiculous mishaps occurred in the performance of her duties.

'J'ai cent fois admiré la patience avec laquelle cette Princesse, quoique peu endurante, supportait mes balourdises,' she writes. 'La première fois que je lui donnai à boire, je versai l'eau sur elle, au lieu de la mettre dans le verre. Le défaut de ma vue, extrêmement basse, joint au trouble où j'étais toujours en l'approchant, me faisait paraître dépourvue de toute compréhension pour les choses les plus simples.'

And again :

‘Madame la duchesse du Maine étant à sa toilette, me demanda de la poudre : je pris la boîte par le couvercle ; elle tomba, comme de raison, et toute la poudre se répandit sur la toilette et sur la princesse, qui me dit fort doucement : “Quand vous prenez quelque chose, il faut que ce soit par en bas.”’

After this, one is not surprised to learn that more suitable employment was found for the awkward waiting maid, whose long attachment to the Duchess will call for further mention.

The efforts at self-control now exerted by Madame du Maine were not in the least strivings after sanctity ; they were but the more intelligent exercise of a strong will, of determination to satisfy that ambition with which she was then consumed, and once enthroned in her kingdom of Sceaux no time was lost, no pains were spared, in developing the idea which had germinated at Versailles, when, dissatisfied with the position there accorded her, her attendance at Court abruptly ceased and she shut herself in with scholars—the idea which dominated the fêtes at Châtenay, and for which the possession of Sceaux gave more scope. This *idée fixe* of which she was possessed—one of self-aggrandisement solely—was, strange as it may seem, no less than herself to hold a Court which should vie with that of Versailles in power and in influence. It may seem equally strange that her ambition was here gratified. The great world pressed to be admitted in larger numbers to Sceaux, where gaiety and wit were the rule, than to Versailles, which, in conformity to the opinions of Madame de Maintenon, exhibited a sober and stiff propriety ill calculated to please a courtesan. It was a great triumph to outnumber and outshine the Court of the most powerful monarch in Christendom. By what means had Ludovise, even with her enchantments, been able to encompass this her heart’s desire ? Madame du Maine attained her influence through the wisdom she displayed in the choice of her society. She had the insight to call to her side not only the great by right of birth but the great by virtue of intellect. Genest was established in the neighbourhood, and Malézieu came to live at Sceaux, so, by visible bonds, securely attaching this so necessary friend to her service. Other savants and men of letters were attracted to Sceaux, lured by the various seductions of flattery and good living, and of a rendezvous which afforded the mental stimulus which operates when alert minds are brought in contact.

The tragic poet, Lagrange-Chancel, the pupil of Racine, ‘un

'petit monstre mais plein d'esprit,' according to Duclos, was introduced to Sceaux by Malézieu, again seeking assistance in his multiform tasks for one who not only wanted amusement but exacted that 'la joie eût de l'esprit.' Once installed at Sceaux there the author remained until he wrote himself and his friends into prison and exile.

A second who eventually suffered disgrace with his friends was the polished and accomplished Cardinal de Polignac, diplomat, orator and Latin poet, who was accused of too great fondness for his Duchess—

'Le cardinal oracle de la France.

Qui des savants a passé l'espérance,
 Qui les soutient, qui les anime tous,
 Qui les éclaire, et qui règne sur nous
 Par les attrait de sa douce éloquence;
 Ce cardinal qui sur un nouveau ton
 En vers latins fait parler la sagesse,
 Réunissant Virgile avec Platon.
 Vengeur du ciel, et vainqueur de Lucrèce.'

Among the more important of those who composed the Court of Sceaux in its earlier period was Fontenelle. The 'parent d'esprit,' as Fontenelle is styled by Voltaire, had a quite different order of intellect from that of his uncle, Corneille. 'Prudent et discret,' yet brilliantly original, versatile though he was, Fontenelle was never tragic. The chief prop and stay in many successive salons, it was at Sceaux—where the grand air of the Court of Louis XIV. and the intellectual impetus of the Hôtel de Rambouillet were found mingled with and enlivened by the more sparkling wit of a more flexible period and with the modern movement of thought of which he was an apostle—that Fontenelle felt most at home.

'C'était le discret Fontenelle,
 Qui, par les beaux-arts entouré,
 Répandait sur eux, à son gré,
 Une clarté douce et nouvelle.

Avec Mairan il raisonnait :
 D'une main légère il prenait
 Le compas, la plume, et la lyre.'

Mairan—associated in these lines from the 'Temple du Goût,'

* 'Le Temple du Goût.' Œuvres complètes de Voltaire. Paris, Garnier Frères, 1877.

with Fontenelle, whom he succeeded as perpetual secretary in the French Academy—was another of those with no patent of nobility but in the front rank of scholarship, who frequented Sceaux at this time. An assiduous habitué was the sharp-sighted Abbé Mongault, who, when asked the nature of the ‘vapors’ with which he was afflicted, demurely replied: ‘It is a terrible malady; it makes ‘one see things as they are!’ The law was represented by two magistrates, each of whom was marked out for special favour by Madame du Maine. ‘Fameux par ses soupers et ‘sa chronologie,’ President Hénault, whose ‘Abrégé Chronologique’ had established his reputation as an historian, did not disdain to write vers de société for the Duchess, who in return called him familiarly her ‘président ordinaire’; the other, the agreeable first President of the Parlement, de Mesmes, she lost the moment he had to make his choice between her and the Regent. The Abbé Chaulieu passed months at a time at Sceaux. In love with every pretty woman, here the amorous abbé was made to behave with propriety, and here Rose de Launay kindled the last flame in his breast, and inspired his muse, when he was about eighty and she over thirty. One of the most brilliant stars among the lettered in the coterie of the Temple, Chaulieu was debarred from the French Academy by the King, who refused to overlook his scandalous manner of life.

Amid these, her choicest spirits, Madame du Maine reserved a quite special warmth of feeling for the Marquis de Sainte-Aulaire, the old gentleman whom she tenderly addressed as ‘son berger,’ whilst she to him was ‘sa bergère.’ Whatever relates to Sainte-Aulaire, as to Fontenelle, cannot fail to excite our curiosity. Like Fontenelle he lived to a great age with the same enjoyment of life, maintaining his intellectual vigour unimpaired. He proves that youth is not indispensable for the poet, for he did not begin to write until the age of sixty, and his verse secured his admission to the French Academy in 1706. It may be added that his equipment was slight, the credentials he brought being nothing more than a quatrain addressed to Madame du Maine. Boileau expostulated, and he was not alone. ‘What! for four verses!’ cried Thomas Corneille, scandalised. ‘Five!’ replied Cardinal de Rohan, and he repeated by heart the play on words improvised by the Marquis when the Duchess teased him on his ignorance in regard to the Cartesian school of philosophy—a production so much after the fashion of the society of Sceaux that we must quote it:

'Bergère, détachons-nous
De Newton, de Descartes.
Ces deux espèces de fous
N'ont jamais vu le dessous
Des cartes, des cartes.'

Sainte-Aulaire was never at a loss to answer a question. 'What is the difference between me and a clock?' asked the Duchess one day. 'The clock marks the hours, whilst your 'serene Highness makes one forget them,' was the ready reply of the old courtier.

'L'aisé, le tendre Sainte-Aulaire,
Plus vieux encor qu'Anacréon,
Avait une voix plus légère;
On voyait les fleurs de Cythère
Et celles du Sacré Vallon
Orner sa tête octogénaire.'*

So Voltaire summarises the art of the charming octogenarian poet, whom report associated with Polignac in familiar connexion with the Duchess. Voltaire himself was among the number of those for whom the hospitable gates of Seeaux swung open wide, and his '*Temple du Goût*' is neither more nor less than a series of portraits of its literary group.

Voltaire made his début in that brilliant world to be met in the Paris salons at the Temple, and Seeaux also received him in 1714 when he was but a boy of twenty. His audacity and his genius were already, wherever he went, making him friends or foes, according to his humour—and their indulgence. A listener to some verses by the Prince de Conti, which the Prince himself read to Madame du Maine, the young Arouet remarked: 'Monseigneur, vous serez un grand poète! Il faut 'que je vous fasse donner une pension par le Roi.' One would have thought that such speeches would have got him into trouble, but in spite of—perhaps because of—his impertinences, Voltaire succeeded in pleasing Madame du Maine, who in fact launched him on his career. It was understood that Seeaux should be a refuge to him, and his alone is the name of commanding eminence and influence with which hers is helpfully connected.

The first among the grands seigneurs to take the lead at Seeaux was Madame du Maine's brother, Louis III., Duc de Condé. The brother and sister were much alike, and the Duc plumed himself upon being a *bel esprit*. Saint-Maur, the Duc's

* *Temple du Goût*, p. 373.

country seat, was near, and there was a constant exchange of visits, and when apart of verses, in which they were assisted by their respective wits attitrés, Chaulieu at Saint-Maur and Genest at Sceaux. Besides this brother—whom she lost in 1710—among the great nobles whose names we find most frequently mentioned are the old but pleasure-loving Duc de Nevers; the Duke of Albemarle, natural son of James II.; the Ducs de La Fare and de Coislin, Comtes d'Harcourt and de Dampierre. And among the great ladies who, like their husbands in respect to the fêtes of Sceaux, served as a bright background to the intellectually eminent—such as Rose de Launay—were the Duchess's cousin, the beautiful 'Diana,' the Duchesse de Nevers, and her daughter, the Duchesse d'Estrées—both very fond of eating, we are told; the Duchesses de Lauzun and de Rohan; the Marquises de Mirepoix and d'Antin, and Mademoiselle de Choiseul.

Rose de Launay, as we have said, stands out—and pre-eminently—among the feminine figures at Sceaux, and to her was due much of the success of the varied entertainments. As a personal attendant on Madame du Maine, her talents for some time, as we have seen, lay hid, and she only emerged from this unsuitable position by the ingenious expedient of leaving about the rooms witty verses and letters, the author of which in such a company of *bels esprits* had only to be known to be appreciated.

'L'auteur que vous cherchez n'habite point les cieux.
Fixez donc à vos pieds vos regards curieux.
Alors, à la clarté d'une faible lumière,
Vous le decouvrirez, gisant dans la poussière !'

This appeared when curiosity had been excited to its highest pitch and gave a hint as to the quarter where the clever writer might be found, and once discovered, her right to be one of the company was immediately recognised. For in no society was intelligence worth so much to its possessor as in that of France in the eighteenth century. As a caste the aristocracy had degenerated; as individuals they were dominated more and more by the intellectuals.

Rose de Launay, afterwards Madame de Staal, must not be confounded with Madame de Staël, Necker's daughter. She was properly Marguerite Cordier, the daughter of a poor painter, but, dissatisfied with her obscure origin, she took her mother's name, Rose Delaunay, ambitiously changing, however, Delaunay into de Launay. Notwithstanding this courageous if reprehensible initiative, the story of the life of this poor girl reads much

more like that of sensitive and impressionable Julie de Lespinasse than that of forcible and masculine Germaine Necker. Of the same emotional temperament and delicacy of constitution as Julie de Lespinasse, Rose had to encounter more than one unhappy love episode, and like her her health was impaired by the nightly vigils imposed upon her by Madame du Maine, who, like Madame du Deffand, Julie's mistress, was afflicted with insomnia. Unlike Julie, Rose married, but marriage brought no release; she never was freed from her thralldom, remaining for life under the yoke of an irritable, tyrannical, and selfish woman. Rose was twenty-seven when she entered Madame du Maine's service, and she died, still in her service, at fifty-three. Like Julie de Lespinasse again, though unfortunate in love, she had the affection of many and the admiration of all. Vertot, Chaulieu, Saint-Pierre and Fontenelle were all her devoted friends, and were glad to be received in her wretched little room, which had neither fireplace nor window but which was brightened and warmed by her presence. Sometimes she escaped to pass a little time by herself at Paris, where she was made welcome at the Temple, and—by way of contrast—at the recherché gatherings of the Hôtel de Lambert. Her '*Mémoires*' read with all the ease and naturalness of a well-written story. The incidents are few, the persons about her being slightly sketched, but like Julie de Lespinasse again, as a piece of subjective writing—a study of her own emotions—the '*Mémoires*' of Madame de Staal, though more restrained than are the outpourings of Julie's heart and mind, are remarkable. Two agreeable comedies, '*L'Enjouement*' and '*La Mode*,' by Madame de Staal, were successfully given at Sceaux, and after all the over-worked dependant left more enduring records of herself than did her all-powerful mistress.

Rose de Launay's small chamber was the meeting-place where the proposals and plans for the celebrated '*Grandes Nuits*' of Sceaux fructified and were developed. Here, she says, '*je fis de mauvais vers pour quelques-unes, les plans de plusieurs autres; je fus consultée par toutes. J'y représentai, j'y chantai.*'

It was in 1714, when Madame du Maine's Court had arrived at the zenith of its glory, that it appeared for a moment as if stricken with a sudden decline; the Muses and Graces seemed to languish, and pleasures to pall. The Duchess had contracted a habit of sleeplessness which Rose in vain attempted to assuage by reading aloud, but at this critical juncture the birds of Sceaux, as Madame du Maine's habitués had of late called themselves, came to her succour, and the

'Grandes Nuits,' when the ^{the}entire night was passed in revelry, were instituted. This special idiosyncrasy lasted about a year and was celebrated once a fortnight, some time being found necessary in the preparation of the entertainment, which became each time more elaborate. On each occasion different persons undertook the management, and the Duke protesting at the expense, those responsible for the night's entertainment took it upon themselves, and made themselves liable for the ballet brought from the Opéra at Paris and similar expensive delights. The 'Grandes Nuits' of Sceaux have a place in the history of the extravagant pleasures of the times beside the fêtes at L'Isle-Adam, Chantilly, Berny, the Temple, and the suppers at the Palais Royal, but with this difference, that at Sceaux the gaiety, if more extravagant, was less indecent.

It was indeed a unique and an extraordinary society which we have sketched; never has there been an equal combination of men of such varied talents and condition gathered in a palatial country residence round a young and ambitious woman of the highest rank, but by no means of the highest intellect. For it was mainly by a remarkable force of will, and by an appreciation of the elements, intellectual and social, which were at the time calculated to impress her world, that the Duchesse du Maine created her Court at Sceaux, one of the most significant and notable illustrations of the social and intellectual tendencies of French society in the age which preceded the Revolution.

Before we examine the later phases of her Court we must consider Madame du Maine in the character of a political conspirator. We have shown that she had succeeded as a leader in the social and intellectual society of Paris;—that the Court of Sceaux vied with that of Versailles. But this did not suffice to satisfy her proud and ambitious spirit, and there is little doubt that in the midst of giddy festivities her head was busy with schemes of a political character, that she aimed at political as well as social power, and that, far from being content with her kingdom of Sceaux, she even dreamed of herself as Queen of France.

Determined and clever we have seen that she was, as well as successful in the attainment of objects which she had set herself to secure. But she was without political capacity and knowledge, and her ambitious attempt to influence the course of politics as she had influenced the society of Paris ended—as might have been expected—in a fiasco. The story has no great historical value, but her position as a Princess of the blood and the wife of Louis XIV.'s favourite—if unlawful—

child gave the episode a notoriety which could not at the time be overlooked. Its result—disastrous to herself, her husband and the friends who supported her—was to strengthen the position of the Regent by providing a pretext to put aside for ever a possible rival in her husband.

The so-called conspiracy of Cellamare culminated in 1718, the year after the signature of the Triple Alliance between France, England and Holland. From the time of the death of Louis XIV. in 1715, his grandson, Philippe V. of Spain, had sought by intrigues to overthrow the Regency of the Duc d'Orléans, and he found in the Duchesse du Maine an ardent coadjutor. The conclusion of the Quadruple Alliance—August 2, 1718—in which the Emperor joined the signatories to the Triple Alliance, and which was aimed directly at Spain, brought the affair to a head. But some earlier incidents should be recalled to make the position of Madame du Maine clear.

As has been previously stated, her unceasing complaints in regard to the equivocal status of the Duc du Maine had the result of drawing from Louis XIV. a new decree in the monarchical hierarchy, one expressly created for the Duc du Maine and his younger brother, the Comte de Toulouse. This edict—registered by the Parliament in 1694—procured the two brothers the privileges of a rank above that of the dukes and peers, but below that of the Princes of the blood. From that time the bastards gradually assumed most of the visible privileges of the legitimate Princes.

As his life neared its end Louis XIV. showed an increased—and in the opinion of many of his subjects, a foolish—affection for his illegitimate children, and as his lawful heirs died one by one, his interest in them—not least in the Duc du Maine—seemed to grow. And so the legitimatised Princes, with other aspirants, began to entertain designs on the Crown which were made possible by the startling deaths in rapid succession of the Dauphin and his sons. Only one—and that one a weakly child of five—remained of the direct line. After this child the King's nephew, the Duc d'Orléans was the lawful heir to the Crown, but Louis' grandson, Philippe V. of Spain, though disbarred by the Treaty of Utrecht, put forward a claim that in the event of the King's death he would be entitled to the Regency during the young King's minority, and in the event of this Prince's death without issue, that he would be the rightful heir to the French Crown, as in the direct line, and in this he was supported by general opinion in France. The bastards were now added to these more or less

lawful claimants of rights to the Regency and to the Crown, and if the Duc du Maine was wanting in courage to support these pretensions, both his wife and Madame de Maintenon were ready and anxious to maintain them.

After the death of the Duc de Berry in 1714, Louis XIV., on July 14, issued the memorable edict by which the legitimatised Princes were accorded not only the rank, honours and precedence enjoyed by the legitimate Princes, but which also, in case of the death of the young Louis, placed Maine and Toulouse and their descendants next in order of succession—the rights of the Duc d'Orléans being overlooked.

The death of Louis XIV. occurred September 1, 1715. It is common knowledge how his will was set aside and the Council of Regency turned into a subsidiary body. The actual result was plain. Orléans was now the ruler of France. In spite of provocation Orléans bore no malice against the legitimatised Princes. Under the suspicion of having poisoned the Dauphin and his sons, he might well have felt his honour involved in the person of the young King being relegated to another, and yet Maine remained guardian of the King, though deprived of any authority over the royal household or the household guards. These were in the hands of the young Duc de Bourbon, the nephew of Madame du Maine, who declared against the new prerogatives. The indignation of Madame du Maine against her nephew was violent and a family quarrel was the result. Orléans was willing to believe that it was only natural for Maine and Toulouse to wish to secure as good a position for themselves as they could. Also, he was their brother-in-law and he did not wish to despoil them of their privileges any more than was necessary. His most influential advisers thought differently. His mother, energetic Elizabeth Charlotte, the Palatine Princess, vehemently opposed the brothers, but more, probably, to be in opposition with Madame de Maintenon, than because she feared for her son's supremacy. Saint-Simon, bitterly prejudiced against the bastards, was at the head of the opposition of the dukes and peers; and Voyer d'Argenson, lieutenant of police and afterwards Garde des Sceaux, assured the Regent that a poignard was pointed at his heart as long as the Duc du Maine had the shadow of a claim to the throne. A bitter family feud, meanwhile, dragged on in procès and counter procès for the next two years between the Princes of the blood and the legitimatised Princes, these being supported by the remnants of the old Court party and disaffected nobles, while the dukes and peers sustained the cause of the Princes of the blood—aided by the known machinations

of the Duchesse du Maine. Finally, at the bed of justice held August 16, 1718, the education of the King was taken from Maine as well as his rank and prerogatives as a Prince of the blood—the privileges of the Comte de Toulouse, at the same time, who happily for himself had no wife to plot on his behalf, being assured to him during his lifetime. It should be borne in mind not only that Orléans was the most capable of the French Princes, but that he had had the sagacity to perceive that England would in the future be a valuable ally, and he cared less than did Louis XIV. for Bourbon alliances. Such a state of affairs and such forces at work—a policy at once new and anti-dynastic in its tendencies, disappointed ambition, a considerable resentment among some of the nobles as well, the possibilities of power—all these produced a situation which well might drive a restless and ambitious woman like the Duchesse du Maine, with an undue opinion of her own powers, owing no doubt in great measure to the flattery which surrounded her in her Court, into an intrigue on behalf of her husband with a foreign Power in the position of Spain.

Cellamare, the ambassador of Spain in Paris, who had resided there since 1715, a man whose action in this intrigue was a measure of his credulity and incapacity, may be regarded as the chief actor, though he was in fact no more than the agent of Alberoni. The primary object of the conspirators—if such they can be called—was to depose the Regent and to take possession of the person of the King, in other words, to make Philippe V. master of France, with Maine as his deputy.* The

* Their aims are thus described by M. de Piépape :

‘Il paraît cependant certain que le but du complot, fomenté par Alberoni et connu par Dubois, dès son origine, était celui-ci : soulever Paris et les provinces contre l'autorité du duc d'Orléans, considérée comme usurpée et oppressive : faire arrêter le Régent dans une fête, l'enlever, l'incarcérer à Tolède ou à Burgos ; se rendre maître de la personne du jeune Roi, “ sous prétexte que les jours de Sa Majesté n'étoient point en sûreté, tant qu'ils restoient à la disposition d'un prince intéressé à les abrégier et capable de le faire. . . .” Soulever le Languedoc, dont le duc du Maine ou son fils était gouverneur, convoquer les Etats généraux du royaume (vœu secret de la duchesse du Maine), afin de les rétablir dans leurs anciens droits, et y annuler tout ce qui avait été fait depuis la mort de Louis XIV., surtout la cassation de son testament, les traités de la triple et de la quadruple alliance, trop contraires aux intérêts de l'Espagne, rendre aux Parlements leurs libertés ; renverser le système de Law ; délivrer la noblesse des prétentions des ducs et pairs ; donner pleine satisfaction à la cour de Rome sur la constitution Unigenitus, faire

Duchess could well dream that she might indeed be a veritable Queen.

The Château de Sceaux was the centre from which radiated the active discontent against Orléans, where all complaints were received, whence flowed pamphlets and satires. Of these Lagrange-Chancel was the most notorious producer, and of his writings the Regent was the butt. Orléans was compared to Nero and Sardanapalus.

Rocher des ondes infernales,
Prépare-toi, sans t'effrayer,
A passer les ombres royales
Que Philippe va t'envoyer.'

Voltaire, also, thrown into the Bastille on a charge of libel, was hardly discharged before he was at Sceaux reading his 'Œdipe,' said to be aimed at Orléans.

From Sceaux, too, issued an active correspondence not only with Cellamare but with Alberoni. Any number of persons, great and small, men and women, became involved in the intrigue, their very number being sufficient to prevent success, though this was never at any moment probable. Every courtier who was dissatisfied with the new régime was ready to assist. The provinces were sounded, and emissaries—not without effect—were sent into Brittany. Among the chief malcontents were Villeroi, Marshal of France, haughty and vain; d'Huxelles, who presided over the council of foreign affairs, and who supported the Duc du Maine in opposing the change of alliances; and even Villars, the general, and d'Effiat, a man of wit and knowledge; d'Harcourt, a protégé of Madame de Maintenon, and Tallard, his rival. All these were representatives of the old Court and its political affiliations. Among them, too, were found the Marquis de Pompadour, the Comte de Laval, Cardinal de Polignac, and the young Duc de Richelieu. Perhaps it is not surprising that amidst these high but discontented spirits, and with her advances warmly received by Alberoni,* the Duchesse du Maine should have utterly lost her

entrer la nation entière dans les vues d'Alberoni, déferer nominale-
ment la régence au roi d'Espagne, effectivement à un lieutenant
assisté d'un conseil, pour administrer le royaume de France au nom
de Philippe V. Ce lieutenant, comme il est aisé de le deviner,
n'eût été autre que le duc du Maine.' ('La Duchesse du Maine,'
par le Général de Piépape, p. 155.)

* Alberoni 'répondit le 6 juin, en exhortant son ambassadeur à
suivre le complot, en accablant la duchesse du Maine d'éloges et
de promesses au nom de Philippe V. et de la reine Elizabeth Farnèse.'

balance. Impatient, restless and changeable, she yet threw all her peculiar energies into the undertaking. For the moment, she felt herself supremely important. The situation was one satisfying to a woman ever desirous of notoriety and power.

At length, as was to be expected, Dubois and the Regent—who had noted the movement partly with amused tolerance and partly with a statesman's annoyance—decided that the time had come to end the affair, an end which, though four of the Breton leaders lost their lives, had less tragic consequences than if it had taken place under a less good-natured ruler than Philippe d'Orléans.

On December 27, 1718, the Duke was arrested at Sceaux and taken to Doullens. The Duchess was in Paris at a house she had taken in the Rue Saint-Honoré, which had become the Parisian centre of the intrigue. In the evening an unknown lady sent by the Marquise de Lambert warned Rose de Launay that arrests would presently be made. The night was passed in anxious expectation. At ten o'clock the next day the house was surrounded with troops. Rose was separated from her mistress and sent to the Bastille. The Duchess was first taken to Dijon, afterwards she was removed to Châlons, then to Savigny, and at the Château de Chamlay she completed her period of captivity. No one was worse fitted to bear imprisonment with dignity or patience. Her main object was to regain her liberty on any terms. On December 14, 1719, she wrote to the Regent:

‘ Il est certain que je suis prête à périr. Je sais que vous n’avez jamais voulu ma mort . . . je prends aussi la liberté, Monsieur, de vous supplier de la parole que vous m’avez fait donner que vous pardonneriez aux personnes qui étaient entrées dans cette malheureuse affaire et que j’ai été obligée de nommer, pour ne pas vous dissimuler la moindre circonstance. Je ne doute pas, Monsieur, de votre clémence et de votre générosité, et c’est dans cette confiance que je me suis livrée à vous sans réserve. . . . Je serais au désespoir qu’il vous restât le moindre doute sur ma sincérité, et je ne veux rien omettre pour que vous en soyez parfaitement convaincu.

‘ J’ose vous supplier avec les dernières instances de remettre M. du Maine en liberté. Je me flatte qu’après le témoignage que je vous rends dans mon mémoire de son innocence, il ne vous restera aucun doute sur ce qui le regarde. Pour moi, Monsieur, c’est de votre générosité que j’attends la fin de ma souffrance. . . .

‘ . . . Vous pouvez compter sur la parole que je vous donne qu’en quelque lieu que je sois, s’il vous restait quelque explication à me demander, je vous la ferai avec la plus exacte sincérité; et, si j’y manque, je consens que vous me fassiez renfermer pour toute ma vie dans la prison la plus affreuse. . . .

‘L’affliction du procès du duc du Maine m’ayant renversé l’esprit . . . ne pouvant plus compter sur la protection du duc d’Orléans, je fus assez malheureuse pour me laisser séduire par les discours de plusieurs personnes mal intentionnées, qui me sollicitèrent de rechercher la protection du roi d’Espagne.

‘Le retour de votre amitié est ce qui me touche le plus. . . Je prends la liberté, Monsieur, de vous demander un entier secret sur tout ceci. . . C’est une grâce que je vous supplie de m’accorder. . . Je demande à Madame la Princesse le même secret que j’ai l’honneur de vous demander.

‘Je vous envoie par M. de la Billarderie une confession très étendue et très sincère. Je puis vous assurer que l’examen a été des plus rigoureux, et que je ne l’aurais pas fait avec plus d’attention s’il s’était agi de me confesser à Dieu même. . . Ayez donc la bonté de m’accorder l’absolution que vous m’avez fait la grâce de me promettre.’ *

At length, in January 1720, she was set free and “allowed to retire to Sceaux, and in July of the same year the Duke too—a conspirator malgré lui—was released. Greatly to his wife’s surprise and chagrin he for some time refused to rejoin her at Sceaux, declaring that he wished to live apart from her, but she did not purpose that her captive should have his liberty and in the end, from force of persuasion, the gentle Prince, as usual, abdicated, and became again the most humble of her subjects.

Disappointed ambition and the experience of imprisonment left no imprint on the character of Madame du Maine. Politics were soon to be forgotten, and the old life of social gaiety tinged with an atmosphere of wit and learning was to be renewed, and with the same zest. If Madame du Maine was a poor conspirator she was at any rate unrivalled as a queen of a court of pleasure and wit.

To describe in detail the life at the Court of Sceaux during its second period would be to repeat to a large extent the description of its first years. Failure and its consequences did not prevent her—in this her maturer age—from resuming the manner of life which she had led when she first began to reign at Sceaux. The following portrait by Madame de Staal reveals Madame du Maine as she appeared at this time to the sharpest pair of eyes in her family circle :

‘Madame la Duchesse du Maine, à l’âge de soixante ans, n’a encore rien acquis par l’expérience ; c’est un enfant de beaucoup d’esprit ; elle en a les défauts et les agréments. Curieuse et crédule,

* Piépape, p. 217.

elle a voulu s'instruire de toutes les différentes connaissances, mais elle s'est contentée de leur superficie. Les décisions de ceux qui l'ont élevée sont devenues des principes et des règles pour elle, sur lesquels son esprit n'a jamais formé le moindre doute; elle s'est soumise une fois pour toutes. Sa provision d'idées est faite; elle rejetterait les vérités les mieux démontrées et résisterait aux meilleurs raisonnements, s'ils contrariaient les premières impressions qu'elle a reçues. Tout examen est impossible à sa légèreté, et le doute est un état que ne peut supporter sa faiblesse. Son catéchisme et la philosophie de Descartes sont deux systèmes qu'elle entend également bien.

'L'idée qu'elle a d'elle-même est un préjugé qu'elle a reçu comme toutes ses autres opinions. Elle croit en elle de la même manière qu'elle croit en Dieu et en Descartes sans examen et sans discussion. Son miroir n'a pu l'entretenir dans le moindre doute sur les agréments de sa figure, le témoignage de ses yeux lui est plus suspect que le jugement de ceux qui ont décidé qu'elle était belle et bien faite. Sa vanité est d'un grâce singulier; mais il semble qu'elle soit moins choquante parce qu'elle n'est pas réfléchie, quoique, en effet, elle en soit plus absurde.'

Her Court was re-established and the same characteristics, intellectual and social, mark the later as they did the earlier time. Some of the same figures appear on the scene, but the death of Genest, in 1719, and of Malézieu, in 1727, removed two who had figured there most prominently. Rose de Launay was still by her side, the same obedient attendant, only transformed, in 1722, into Madame de Staal by her marriage with a Swiss officer in the Duc du Maine's regiment, who had a country house conveniently near; an unhappy marriage instigated by her mistress and carried through by her efforts. With Lamotte-Houdard, the poet and critic, on whom had fallen the mantle of Malézieu, the Duchess carried on a voluminous semi-sentimental correspondence, but his death also occurred in 1731. Saint-Aulaire still lingered, still gallant, and still à la mode.

Voltaire is, however, the most important personage who meets our view. In the first period he was a mere unknown youth with his way to make; now he was fast becoming the cynosure of all eyes. Always in trouble, Voltaire found Sceaux desirable as a sanctuary, and he exerted himself to be agreeable. It was during one of his periods of hiding here in company with Madame du Châtelet that he wrote 'Zadig,' and besides a number of smaller pieces written and played at Sceaux, 'Oreste,' 'Sémiramis' and 'Catiline, ou Rome sauvée,' were here composed under the auspices of Madame du Maine, and were produced in the theatre of Sceaux,

June 21, 1750. From a letter to the Duchess it would appear that she had collaborated with Voltaire in this piece, and that its success was due to her :

'. . . Ma protectrice,

'Il faut que votre protégé dise à Votre Altesse que j'ai suivi en tout les conseils dont elle m'a honoré. Elle ne saurait croire combien Cicéron et César y ont gagné. Ces messieurs-là auraient pris vos avis s'ils avaient vécu de votre temps. Je viens de lire "*Rome sauvée*." Ce que Votre Altesse Sérénissime a embelli a fait un effet prodigieux. (Novembre 1749.)

'Je me suis tellement rempli l'esprit de la lecture de Cicéron, de Salluste et de Plutarque, et mon cœur s'est si échauffé par le désir de vous plaire, que j'ai fait la pièce en huit jours ; je suis épouvanté de cet effort ; il n'est pas croyable mais il a été fait pour Mme la duchesse du Maine. . . . Nous avons répété aujourd'hui la pièce avec ces changements, et devant qui, madame ? devant des Cordeliers des Jésuites, des Pères de l'Oratoire. Vous ne sauriez croire quel succès votre tragédie a eu dans cette grave assemblée. . . . Ame de Cornélie ! Nous amènerons le Sénat romain aux pieds de Votre Altesse, lundi.'*

His correspondence with d'Argental, however, explains his epistolary fervour, and proves, alas, that the greater part of this discourse was simple flattery and that it was prompted by self-interest :

'Je n'ai pu me dispenser d'instruire Mme. la duchesse du Maine que j'ai fait ce Catilina qu'elle m'avait tant recommandé. C'était elle qui m'en avait donné la première idée, et je lui dois au moins l'hommage de la confiance. J'aurai besoin de sa protection ; elle n'est pas à négliger. Mme. la duchesse du Maine, tant qu'elle vivra, disposera de bien des voix, et fera retentir la sienne.' †

A no less interesting figure of Madame du Maine's Court in its later period was Madame du Deffand, who, still young and in her most charming days, and accompanied by the inseparable Hénault, was one of its chief attractions. The Marquise du Deffand has been so often described ‡ that to mention her name in this connexion is sufficient, but her presence is historically important because her stay at Seeaux unites Madame du Maine's Court with the famous salons of Paris, and makes a continuity between it and those remarkable assemblies which, as time goes on, we recognise as of the first moment in the history of pre-Revolutionary France.

As Madame du Deffand connects Seeaux with later eighteenth

* Piépape, p. 320.

† Ibid. p. 322.

‡ See *Edinburgh Review*, January 1901.

century salons, so Madame du Maine was a link between the Hôtel de Rambouillet—first of salons—and the convent of Madame du Deffand at the Rue Saint-Dominique, and between two eras, the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. The position of Madame du Maine was shared with another exceptionally important lady, the Marquise de Lambert, and the two became friends. The Hôtel de Lambert was more exclusively a centre of literary life than the palace of Sceaux. Less self-centred than Madame du Maine, Madame de Lambert pretended to no Court and in her salon self-sufficiency was neither practised nor tolerated. Madame du Maine was the clever, brilliant mondaine; Madame de Lambert, on the other hand, thoughtful as well as clever, desired and acquired thoughtfulness as well as cleverness in her guests. So far from wishing to attract attention to herself, the interest her writings excited may have been increased by the difficulties encountered in gaining access to them, but whatever the reason, Madame du Maine was most desirous to become acquainted both with the author and her works, and to attend her literary gatherings, as the following epistle to Lamotte will testify :

O mardy respectable ! . . . mardy imposant ! mardy plus redoutable pour moy que tous les autres jours de la semaine ! mardy qui avés servi tant de fois au triomphe des Fontenelle, des Lamotte, des Mairan, des Mongault ! mardy auquel est interdit l'aimable abbé de Bragelonne ! et pour dire encore plus : mardy où préside Mme. de Lambert ! Je reçois avec une extrême reconnaissance la lettre que vous avés eu la bonté de m'écrire. Vous changés ma crainte en amour, et je vous trouve plus aimable que les mardy gras les plus charmants. Mais il manque encore quelque chose à ma gloire ; c'est d'être reçue à votre auguste sénat. Vous voulés m'en exclure en qualité de Bergère ? Ce seroit alors que je pourrois dire que le mardy est le plus beau jour de ma vie. J'ay grand besoin de ce secours pour apprendre à écrire et à parler ; mais il n'est nullement nécessaire, pour cognoistre et chérir le mérite de ceux qui composent vos merveilleuses assemblées.' *

Madame du Maine then was enrolled among the shepherds and shepherdesses who pressed about Madame de Lambert on her Tuesdays, and this rapprochement between the two leaders of French society was the beginning of an intimate intercourse, both personal and by correspondence. It was Madame de Lambert, as we have seen, who sent the warning of her arrest to Madame du Maine. Both these great ladies were regarded as examples by the celebrated group of women who, in the

* Piépape, p. 3.

mid-eighteenth century, succeeded to their places, but it was more especially the work of Madame du Maine, who possessed more independence of character than her friend and rival, to unite at her Court the features of the two distinct and opposite epochs—the autocratic and limited character of a waning traditional aristocracy, and the restless and resistless activities, the stirrings and strivings of a rising intellectual democracy.

Though she became devout, and attempted to bring her recusant habitués to follow her example, the last years of the Duchesse du Maine proceeded without any marked change in the artificial, idyllic pursuit of pleasure led by her Court. Her manners became more polite and, always coquettish in her dress, she grew yet more fastidious in regard to her personal appearance. The losses common to advanced years passed lightly over her. The death of Malézieu had affected her not at all, and that of the Duke after a long illness—throughout which he was well nursed by his wife—in 1736, caused no break in her life. The death of her only daughter also, in 1743, was the occasion of no disturbance. As no husband who could fulfil her mother's ambitious views was found for her, she remained single, and passed the greater part of her forty-five years in a convent. Madame de Staal, prematurely aged by her hard service, died in 1750.

Though Louis XV. always showed consideration towards his aunt, the proud little Duchess seldom visited his Court. She did not approve of the royal mistresses, and she preferred to receive rather than to render homage. In 1732 the beautiful renaissance Château of Anet came into Madame du Maine's possession by inheritance. This treasure-house of art still stands, though some of its material parts have been transported to Paris. The exquisite fountain of Diana—the château was built by Henri II. for Diane de Poitiers—may be seen in the Louvre, and the magnificent gateway in the court of the Beaux-Arts. The Duchess's highly developed æsthetic sense made the possession of Anet another source of delight, and thenceforward the time of herself and her Court was divided between Sceaux and Anet.

But in 1751 that amazing and unique social and literary gathering, of which we have endeavoured to sketch the course and the characteristics, came to an end. The health of the Duchess—for a long time failing—at length obliged her to quit the country and she installed herself in Paris in the magnificent Hôtel Moras at the corner of the Rue de Varennes and the Boulevard des Italiens—an eighteenth century building which she purchased in 1736, one still extant, and no less superb in

its decorations and appointments than her other abodes. The restless life was near its end, and her death occurred on January 23, 1753, at the age of seventy-seven. She was survived by her two sons, who never married, and with them the house of Maine became extinct.

If we stand to-day at Anet or at Sceaux—where if ghosts ever walk hers must surely linger—in a France so different from that in which she played her part, and endeavour to recall the past and her personality, we see that the bar sinister on the house of Maine made a disappointed woman of the Duchess. We see that, dominated by pride of birth and love of power, no sooner did she realise the want of status of her husband than she resented it, that she never became reconciled to it, and that, child as she was at the time of her marriage, from that time she worked with one—and that an impossible—end in view: that of eradicating this dark stain. As to the Prince himself we find astonishingly little to remind us of either of his forcible parents. He always gave way to his wilful wife and he suffered the unhappy consequences. Neither rose much above the narrow range of thought of their caste. Madame du Maine cultivated the society of savants and men of letters, but it was not as a seeker after truth, as a reformer, or even to pose as their protectress: it was merely to extort pleasure in a refined form from them; while the Duke's natural disposition and aims were simply those of a kindly and peace-loving gentleman, of a recluse and a scholar. The best of mankind are not always the most interesting, and the contrast of character exhibited in Madame du Maine—her consistency and her frivolity, her energy in objects of small value, her active interest in literature and science, and yet the narrow groove of thought from which there is no question of her ever emerging—are individual traits which cannot fail to strike the attention. Her attempt at a political conspiracy was more like an escapade than a serious, thought-out plan, and it proceeded not from love of country but from love of self. We can trace no aspiration of the soul. She seemed to be wanting in spiritual qualities and in simple affection. Particular in her taste, socially her example was against the grosser pleasures of the period. Voltaire respected her literary judgements, but she had no deep convictions or truly great aims. She did not influence the ideas of a Diderot, like that gentler character, Madame d'Épinay. D'Alembert passed through her Court with Madame du Deffand, but she had for no man or woman that passion of friendship and service which Madame du Deffand lavished on d'Alembert. She was no

goddess of beauty, no sensuous Ninon de Lenclos. She was rather of the order of the celebrated bourgeoisie Madame Geoffrin in disposition and character. The private life of each was exceptionally decorous, and each was as hard as she was cold, and ruled her Court and her husband with an iron hand ; but while the eminent bourgeoisie was celebrated for solid sense, it was a useful quality of which the elf-like little Duchess was totally devoid, as was the Queen of the Rue Saint Honoré of the brilliancy and grace, the fastidious idiosyncrasies of Ludovise, Queen of the Bees. Madame du Maine was other and more than a mere mondaine, an extravagant and shrewish wife, and a short-sighted and reckless political adventurer. All these she was ; but in addition she had the capacity to gather together and to retain a society, in which were united the opposing elements of the old and new order, more than any other of her immediate time. Madame du Maine never lost the taste for study. True to the ideals proper to the leader of a salon, she encouraged learning and the arts, and the very lavishness which threatened ruin made her an excellent patron. For herself it can only be said that she wrote little pieces for her theatre, and verses in the way of repartee, which in their easy cleverness reflected herself, and her letters dealt lightly and brightly with the surface of things—which are, perhaps, the best gifts for letter-writing. Madame du Maine is the best example that could be given of the excess which characterised her time, and she is a type—an extreme type—of a caste and of an important section of French women before the Revolution. Her mind and her tastes, in an exaggerated form, were typical of those of other wives and daughters of noblemen, and her restless life was significant of a mental and moral restlessness to be noticed in many others as well as in this tiny descendant of the great Condé. Her entire surroundings with the social and literary atmosphere enable us to form a vivid picture of society in France in the first half of the eighteenth century. Proud and independent, brave and clever—and eager for notoriety—did Madame du Maine live to-day she would no doubt be in the van in the present manifestation of the feminist movement.

ART. XI.—LORD GOSCHEN.

The Life of George Joachim Goschen, First Viscount Goschen, 1831–1907. By the HON. ARTHUR D. ELLIOT. With portraits. Two vols. London: Longmans. 1911.

THE question is sometimes asked if the life of an eminent statesman should be written by one who sympathises with his political opinions. Probably the answer depends on whether the biography is published, as is now usual, shortly after the death of a statesman. In that case a close degree of sympathy and agreement is almost essential. The chief advantage of a contemporary biography is the opportunity it gives of throwing light upon the character of the subject as it appeared to those persons to whom he revealed himself in intimate converse and association, and of portraying the impression made upon those who had the greatest facilities for judging. The inner motives of much political action are only revealed to those who have worked with the actor and been familiar with the processes of thoughts by which his conclusions were reached, while the historical results of that action must in many cases be hidden alike from contemporary critics whether friendly or the reverse, and may safely be left to the judgement of posterity. It is undoubtedly well, therefore, that the career of a great man should be described, as it appeared to them, by friends or intimates while they still survive to perform the task and before the personal knowledge of events, so often unrecorded, has faded into disputable oral tradition. The best of modern biographies have as a matter of fact been produced in these conditions, and there is little fear that they will ever be superseded as first-hand authorities on their subject, however perspectives may change with the lapse of years.

As to the form which such a biography should take we have always felt that there is much to be said either for a brief political study like Condorcet's 'Turgot' or Disraeli's 'Lord George Bentinck,' which on account either of its subject or its treatment may have an enduring value, or for a publication of letters and documents with a merely explanatory comment like Parker's 'Sir Robert Peel,' which allows the subject of the book to speak for himself, and the reader to form his own opinion on evidence complete, as far as it goes, of the character and achievement of a public man. The ordinary biographical method, while it allows of a far more detailed presentation of

character both private and public, an obvious advantage over the other two, imposes upon the writer the necessity of giving a bird's-eye view of great historical events based very often, in the absence of full public or private records, upon insufficient information; the prominence given to the central figure of the book is apt to exaggerate his position in relation both to the events described and to the other actors in the drama; and consideration for the feelings of family and friends (whose co-operation alone makes the publication possible) may easily give the work an appearance of indiscriminate eulogy or of determined vindication. Such are some of the pitfalls of this most difficult form of biography, and they can only be surmounted by a combination of good taste and real knowledge. Several recent biographies have successfully avoided them, and not the least successful have been one or two written either by a son or a widow. The Lives of Bishop Creighton, of Lord Granville, of Lord Randolph Churchill must always remain the best authorities for their subject, and we shall be surprised if Mr. Arthur Elliot's Life of the late Lord Goschen does not take rank with such works as these. Lord Goschen's family indeed are to be complimented upon their choice of a biographer who, as a distinguished student of history and politics and member of Parliament for many years, has been intimately acquainted with the leading politicians on both sides, and who, in more than one of the political crises in which his subject was a principal actor, has himself played a part no less honourably courageous and independent. On the Home Rule controversy and the inner history of Liberal Unionism there is no higher living authority than Mr. Elliot, and his treatment of this crucial episode alone will give this book a permanent value and interest. We may add that Mr. Elliot has used his materials, which must have been very voluminous, with judgement and with what some may consider almost too great economy; but that by doing so he has succeeded in producing a narrative of continuous and engrossing interest, and in giving us what ought to be the main object of a biography, a vivid picture of a man and his character.

Lord Goschen was one of those whose special gifts early mark them out for distinction in public life. But it may be questioned whether, considering that he did not belong to the class which in his day still held the lead in Parliament and trained its sons to politics and the prospect of office, he would have had the opportunity of devoting himself to the career which he was to adorn, while young enough to ensure parliamentary success, if he had not been blessed with a sin-

gularly wise father. William Henry Göschén, the third son of the eminent Leipzig publisher, whose 'Life and Times' were described by his famous grandson, had settled in 1814 in London, where he was to prosper as the predominant partner, for half a century, of the firm of Frühling and Göschén. So remarkable a man deserves to be commemorated.

'My father,' writes Lord Goschen, 'had prospered in London by means of intense industry, great commercial insight and corresponding thrift; but no breadwinning labour, however intense, diminished the brightness of his intellectual powers or blurred his vision of all the wider aspects of the world. Considering what may soon be called the prehistoric assiduity of the business man, to whom the present fashion of many holidays and shortened hours would have been considered a dangerous and demoralising heresy, it is a marvel to me how my father managed to accumulate an immense stock of historical and literary knowledge. In later times my Oxford friends, when they visited me in my home, were astonished at his intellectual versatility and power of expression, and declared him to be one of the cleverest men they had ever met. Books and music had been the one solace of his bachelor evenings during the fifteen years of his bachelorhood in London. But he was at the same time socially inclined, and many musicians, Mendelssohn among them, had been his friends.'

Such was the father, who added to these fine qualities the merit of devoted and discriminating care for his son. 'My father's ambition for me at all times,' wrote that son in after years, 'was almost a passion. He staked an infinite and pathetic amount of happiness on my success.' Destining him at first for a commercial career, Mr. William Henry Göschén sent the boy at the age of eleven to a school in Saxe Meiningen, where he spent three years and 'laid a solid foundation of mental material'; but influenced apparently by his perception of the boy's exceptional powers he then determined to give him a public school and university education with a view to fitting him for public life. To Rugby accordingly young Goschen was sent under Dr. Tait, and there for a time 'his German name, his half German blood and German school-ing' gave him an uncomfortable time among schoolfellows to whom he was far superior in cultivation and intelligence. His letters home were not of the usual prosaic matter-of-fact order, but revealed his thoughts and sentiments in a manner very gratifying to a biographer, for they bring out his character very clearly. High-minded, intellectual, industrious, ambitious, as a boy; he retained these characteristics as a man, together with a sensitiveness, heightened perhaps by his early public

school ordeal, which clung to him through life and which, by hindering him from showing except to his intimates his real geniality, somewhat detracted from his popularity in public and official life. But encouraged by his father and helped by his own manly character he soon triumphed over his difficulties, and long before he became head of the school he was 'one of the most popular as well as one of the most distinguished and 'respected boys in the school.' His prizes for the English Essay, Prize Poem and Historical Essay showed the bent of his mind, and paved the way for his entering in 1850 as a Commoner at Oriel College in the University, of which he was to die as Chancellor fifty-eight years later.

At Oxford he fully satisfied his father's ambition for him. Although his 'forte was not scholarship' he took a First Class in Moderations, an Exhibition at Oriel, and in 1853 a First in Greats, the best of his year. But more important perhaps than academical distinctions was the mark he made on his contemporaries as a man of real power. His intimate friend Franck Bright, the historian, and until lately Master of University College, writes of him :

'The conversation in his company invariably touched on serious and important matters. He was as far as possible from priggishness. His sense of humour was quite unusually strong, his tolerance of folly and boyishness (I do not think of stupidity) was very marked. He was what the slang of the day calls "thoroughly human" and he enjoyed to the full the lighter side of college life.'

In the summer of 1852 Goschen formed a society for intellectual discussion, the original members of which contained Arthur Butler, the first headmaster of Haileybury, Charles Stuart Parker, H. W. Oxenham, George Brodrick, W. Fremantle and Charles Henry Pearson, and which were afterwards joined by Franck Bright, Frederic Harrison, Grant Duff, and others. But it was perhaps at the Union (of which he became President) that he showed the greatest promise of future eminence as a statesman. He established a high reputation for eloquence, and his friends specially praised a speech on Shelley in which as he says he 'felt himself at liberty to gratify the society with a speech I 'know they always like, of enthusiasm, poetry, language, and 'feeling.' Nor did he neglect to exercise the debating faculties, and he acquired the habit of speaking with little preparation which was to serve him well in later life. One of his friends, Jex Blake, with youthful enthusiasm described him as 'far the 'most eloquent person I ever heard anywhere, and I think the

'only genius we have had at Rugby in my time.' All this is a little surprising to those who remember him only on Budget nights in the House of Commons. Always effective and well expressed, his speeches seemed somewhat laboured, and were certainly lacking in the graces of voice and manner ; but he had doubtless the temperament of the orator, and when inspired by a great subject the sacred fire would occasionally show forth, and he was capable of rousing a popular audience to a high pitch of enthusiasm.

Ten years were now to elapse before Goschen had the opportunity of entering upon the public career for which he seemed marked out, but those ten years were passed in a preparation even more fruitful than the formal training of school and college. They gave him a practical training for statesmanship of the sort which has usually fallen to budding politicians of the landlord class by their participation in local administration, but one which, by its wider and at the same time more special character, was to be of even greater importance in the coming years. For he was fortunate in having the opportunity of stepping at once into a partnership in a leading City house, for such Fröhling and Göschen had become. Already in his last year at Oxford the business of his father's firm had begun to play a part in the correspondence, and he was getting 'practically into touch with international commerce and the mysteries of foreign exchange.' In 1854, the year following his departure from Oxford, he was sent by his father to superintend the affairs of the firm in the almost equatorial regions of New Granada, where his headquarters were at Bogota, and his duties took him travelling on mules or on horseback all over the State. It was a rough, adventurous life which added vigour to his constitution, and during which he found time not only for elaborate business despatches to his father, but also for correspondence on political and general topics with his friends Bright, Godfrey Lushington, C. H. Pearson, Fryer and Longe. It is not surprising, however, that after a time he should have begun to show a desire to

'return once more to the great world, from this little world, and to live in the centre of those great events of which only the "press copy" now reaches me. But if I were to live in England now, and had been all this time, I should have been very mad. How can we live calmly now? Good Heavens! all seem to be making the greatest fools of themselves from Lord John to Charles Dickens. All at cross purposes, all provokingly exaggerated, all running into extremes. Oh! confound them all, they make me sick of reading the papers. No! I prefer reading the books you sent me. "Westward Ho"

is exquisite, truly beautiful with such a fine heroic spirit and deep earnest views. It is interesting too from the scene lying partly in these countries, and many of the names being quite familiar to me.'

Before his departure George Goschen had become engaged to Miss Lucy Dalley, the charming and capable lady who so fully shared his interests and assisted his career during a long and most happy married life. Mr. Goschen had at first opposed so early and, as he thought, improvident a marriage; and had hoped that his son's attachment might be weakened by absence. But in 1857, the year after his return home, in his twenty-sixth year, the marriage took place, and Goschen settled down to become his father's right-hand man, and indeed 'the 'driving-wheel of the machine.' He never did anything by halves, and while remaining interested in public affairs he devoted himself whole-heartedly to business, and soon won the highest of reputations in the City. In his twenty-seventh year he became a Director of the Bank of England, and a few years later, in 1861, he published a book which immediately became, and has remained, the classical authority on the subject, the 'Theory of Foreign Exchanges.' It is sufficient to say here that the book is a triumph of clear thinking and lucid exposition of observed facts. It had doubtless something to do with his selection, to his own great surprise, as a candidate for a vacancy which occurred two years later in the representation of the City of London by the death of Mr. Western Wood, and after a period of suspense he was returned unopposed on the 1st of June 1863.

'I owed my introduction to political life,' wrote Lord Goschen some forty years afterwards, 'to two of my colleagues at the Bank of England, my old faithful friends, Robert Crawford and Kirkman Hodgson, splendid specimens of the British Merchant, cultivated, versed in all the higher questions both of commercial and banking finance, and wielding an exceptional influence in the City. Crawford was himself a Member for the City, in conjunction with Baron Lionel Rothschild and Alderman William Lawrence. At this distance of time I can still vividly recall my unbounded astonishment when my two friends came to my office with the suggestion that I should stand for the City of London. Though from early days Westminster had been the goal of my hopes, I had never dreamt that the opening would come so soon, or in so brilliant a form.'

The joy and pride of his father, then at Carlsbad for a cure, were unbounded, and he could hardly believe in

'so stupendous a distinction and advancement both for his son and for himself.' It was indeed, as he wrote, 'the very end of all my endeavours and aspirations, for up to this mark I may say that part

of your success has had its origin in those things which I have been able to perform, for instance, your position in society and in the commercial world.'

Many were the affectionate and anxious counsels he pressed upon his son, unselfishly urging him to lighten the burden that business must impose upon his time and activities, although Mr. Charles Goschen, his second son, was then a very young man, and his future eminence in the City as head of the firm when his elder brother had finally severed his connexion with it could hardly have been foreseen at that time.

The City of London was then and for some years to come predominantly Liberal in politics, and like most of the leading City merchants Mr. Goschen was a Whig and a Free Trader. This fact had no doubt given a Liberal bent to his son's opinions, whose early speeches and writings, poetical and other, at Oxford had always revealed a romantic love of freedom; and there was therefore every reason why George Goschen, like most young men of distinguished ability before the birth of Tory democracy, should have entered political life as a strong Liberal. But his Liberalism was less a matter of sentiment than of intellectual conviction, and mere party attachment had little to do with it. Mr. Elliot quotes from one of Goschen's Oxford notes a passage, part of which is worth reproducing here as it strikes a keynote of his attitude in later years on this point.

'He who joins a party, as a party, at the first commits a fatal error which it will be difficult to retrace. He who procures the dependence of others has sold his own independency of will; he who has fettered his actions by joining a party, not by conscientiously subscribing to a creed, has committed a crime against his country, and done himself an injury of which he must reap the fruits. If he pawns his judgment to buy up votes, his fortunes must rise high indeed before he will be able to redeem what he pledged. Then perhaps it may not be called perfidy if he break the iniquitous covenant he made. . . . No one thing is so calculated to inspire us with confidence as the conviction that those in whom we are to confide are themselves convinced of the soundness of their own principles—that they have faith in their cause and in themselves. In spite of prejudices abundantly displayed in the course of this debate, consistency is not the highest form of virtue nor inconsistency one of the worst forms of crime. To lay too much stress upon it is eminently dangerous. It is to hold out inducements to men to continue in error after they have discovered it, to lend a deaf ear to argument, lest their convictions which they are bound never to alter should receive a shock.'

As we follow Goschen's career we shall be able to trace the bearing of these early reflexions upon his action. At the time

of which we are now speaking he was generally looked upon as a rather advanced Liberal ; so much so that when he entered the Cabinet as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster on the invitation of Lord Russell in January 1866 after three years only of private membership, Lord Hartington's advancement to Cabinet rank on the same date was looked upon as a make-weight on the Whig side.

Goschen's rapid rise was a remarkable tribute to his intellectual ability and oratorical power. It so happened that the subjects on which he might have spoken with weight were not to the fore when he entered the House of Commons, and he made his reputation on the question of the abolition of tests in the Universities. He enhanced it by a most successful speech in seconding the Address in 1864, and his interview with the veteran leader of the House of Commons, Lord Palmerston, may be here quoted :

' My interview with the veteran statesman remains fixed in my memory as one of the most memorable incidents of my career, and his observations to me on that occasion have an historical interest as illustrating his state of mind at that time, and his attitude towards reforms and domestic legislation. The old man's manner to me was one of extraordinary cordiality, and full of life. Instructing me as to the topics to be dealt with in the speech, he ran through the various points of foreign policy that required to be touched. They were sufficiently numerous and important. When he came to a stop as if he had finished his instructions, I asked him with becoming diffidence, " What is to be said about domestic affairs and legislation ? " " Oh," he gaily replied, rubbing his hands with an air of comfortable satisfaction, " there is really nothing to be done. We cannot go on adding to the Statute Book *ad infinitum*. Perhaps we may have a little law reform, or bankruptcy reform ; but we cannot go on legislating for ever." Be it remembered this was in 1864. There were looming on the horizon some of the greatest problems which have ever been submitted to Parliament—parliamentary reform, the ballot, education, far-reaching measures affecting the Church. In fact, a new legislative era was before long to set in, but to the eyes of the cheerful octogenarian, the Statute Book was full enough. However, I somewhat audaciously determined that I would not give the go-by in my speech to the internal situation. I would show sympathetically, if possible, that in my eyes domestic affairs bore some large proportion to foreign policy, and I took infinite pains to make a creditable appearance. My speech was highly prepared ; it was a bold throw for success ; if I had failed, I should have been held to be presumptuous and possibly ridiculous, but I did not fail. Writing, as I am, forty years after this time, I may be pardoned for recording that I was extremely successful. The position was all the more full of risk since I felt that in the extreme

uncertainty and the critical state of foreign affairs at that moment, not only the House but even Europe was waiting with much impatience the utterance of the great parliamentary leaders.'

The country was in a delicate position as regarded the Schleswig-Holstein question, and Goschen's language had to be carefully chosen. He looked on this speech as defining his general attitude both towards foreign and domestic questions during his whole political life, and the following short extract from his autobiographical fragment is therefore important.

'I was anxious,' he writes, 'to give special colour to my remarks. The Manchester School with its strong inclination to non-intervention, and its too absolute devotion in my judgement to peace at any price, seemed disposed to give the impression that its doctrines were those of the great Liberal party. They were the "Little Englanders," if I may say so, of that period. On the other hand, there were a group of academical Liberals and others who would in these days be called "Jingoes" or "Imperialists." I wished clearly to establish this fact. On the other hand the attitude of some of the extreme Radicals towards the upper classes and their alleged indictment against the latter for their indifference to the poor, had jarred upon me, and in this respect, too, I thought it right to show that one wing of the Liberal party repudiated such attitude.'

Goschen's remarks on the non-intervention policy brought him a sharp rebuke from Mr. Cobden for making reflexions on the conduct of Mr. Bright and himself, to which he replied warmly protesting against the assumption that he was untrue to his profession of adherence to the principal tenets of Liberal or Radical doctrine because he refused to associate himself with the Cobdenic view of foreign policy, or with the opinions 'which Mr. Bright had so often and so strongly expressed as to the motives and intentions of the governing classes, views which I must honestly confess appear to me 'most dangerous.'

When Mr. Goschen accepted office as Vice-President of the Board of Trade a few weeks before his elevation to the Cabinet, he was forced to a final decision between business and politics, together with a large sacrifice of future wealth if he decided for the latter. As Mr. Elliot puts it 'he must be the servant 'either of the State or of Frühlings and Göschen, and must 'devote to the service of whichever master he chose the whole 'of his energies.' His father would have preferred that the decision should have been deferred for a year or two longer when the provision, without which he considered that George Goschen should not enter an administration with its possibilities of a seat in the Cabinet and an eventual peerage, had been

assured. Mr. Goschen, however, had no difficulty in deciding on his course; he retired from his lucrative partnership and from the Bank of England, and took his seat on the Front Bench, with Mr. Gladstone for the first time leading the House of Commons as Chancellor of the Exchequer.

We do not propose to follow in any detail Lord Russell's short-lived Ministry, which fell on its failure to pass the moderate Reform Bill of 1866, nor on that of the Derby-Disraeli administration which succeeded it, and carried the infinitely more democratic measure of Household Suffrage.

Those years witnessed the last rally of Conservative opposition to democratic advance in the revolt of the Adullamites on the Liberal side, and in the resignation of the three Conservative Ministers from Lord Derby's Government as a protest on behalf of political honour against Mr. Disraeli's manœuvres. A perfectly vain rally, for the 'country had begun to speak 'for itself,' and the era of Whig dalliance with reform had passed away for ever.

'Parliamentary oratory in England,' observes Mr. Elliot, 'never rose to a higher level than during the Reform debates of 1866 and 1867, when George Goschen, in the heartiest sympathy with his reforming colleagues, sat in 1866 as a Minister of the Crown on the Front Bench and on the Speaker's right, and in 1867 as one of the Leaders of Opposition on the Speaker's left hand. The boyish dream in his earlier days of the glories of parliamentary debate must have been more than realised as he listened to the speeches of Gladstone and Bright, of Lowe and Disraeli. His own first speech as Cabinet Minister on a subject of prime importance was made on the sixth night of the second reading debate on the Russell-Gladstone Reform Bill.'

It was not until 1868, when the Derby-Disraeli Ministry, which had never enjoyed the confidence of the country, fell, and an appeal to the country on the new franchise had resulted in a majority of one hundred for the Liberals, that Mr. Goschen, who had however during the preceding year made his general attitude towards the more important political questions pretty well understood, had an opportunity of continuous administrative work. At the close of that year Mr. Gladstone as the acknowledged leader of the Liberal party became Prime Minister at the head of a Cabinet which he afterwards used to describe as one of the best instruments for Government that ever were constructed. In that Cabinet Mr. Goschen took his seat with universal approval as President of the then Poor Law Board after a contest for the City of London under the new system of minority representation, which caused

the maximum of inconvenience and cost him 2800*l*. During the election campaign he had shown the ardour and thoroughness of his desire for reform in many directions besides the main issue on which the contest turned, that of the disestablishment of the Irish Church; he laid special stress on National Economy, on National Education, and on the reform of Local Government and Taxation; and he looked forward with eager hope to the part which the newly enfranchised working classes would be able to take in directing the destinies of the country.

Of the first of Mr. Goschen's three long bouts of high office as a member of one of the greatest and most successful reforming administrations of the century Mr. Elliot gives an interesting sketch, which we will follow out so far as it illustrates his political point of view. He does not seem to have had any kind of disagreement with his chief and his other colleagues, and in his own department he attracted the special hostility of the Opposition by the views he put forward in his celebrated Report on Local Taxation (March 1871), and the abortive Local Government and Taxation Bills of the same year.

In the spring of 1871, on the breakdown of Mr. Childers's health, Mr. Goschen was invited by Mr. Gladstone to take up the higher position in his Cabinet of First Lord of the Admiralty, and this change of office brought him into closer contact with the questions of foreign and imperial policy on which he had on several occasions shown that he had strong opinions not altogether in sympathy with those of a large section of his party.

In September 1870 M. Thiers was in London endeavouring to persuade Lord Granville to exercise what influence he could to induce the Prussians to accept moderate terms of peace, and Mr. Gladstone was strongly in favour of engaging the other neutral Powers to assist in a protest against the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine. Mr. Goschen sided with Mr. Gladstone, who was beaten in the Cabinet on this question by Lord Granville, and he gave his reasons in a letter of remarkable cogency addressed to the latter.

In 1873 he acted with Mr. Cardwell and Lord Kimberley in insisting on proper preparation being made for the Ashanti expedition, and during these years, while doing his utmost to meet Mr. Gladstone's views in reducing expenditure, he yet succeeded in winning the complete confidence of the Navy and of men acquainted with naval requirements. He had indeed no difficulty in resisting attempted Navy panics, for there was in these fortunate days no comparison

possible between the naval strength of other nations and our own.

The main interest of the last forty years of English political history for future generations will no doubt lie in the gradual assertion of democratic ideas of government and its effect upon the character of public men. The *volte-face* which Disraeli educated his party to make on the franchise question in 1867 doubtless settled the question as to the form which British political institutions were to take by destroying Conservatism as an effective barrier against democratic change, and it became thenceforward inevitable that both political parties should be popular in character, both indeed competitors for popular favour. However inevitable the end, however noble the ideal of a free self-governing people, the process of transition was bound to be demoralising to parties which were both still largely aristocratic in *personnel*, but especially to the so-called Conservative party, which from the nature of things could not so frankly accept and recognise the changed conditions.

It was no doubt easier in the 'seventies and 'eighties of the last century to hold optimistic views of the capacity of the classes enfranchised by the measures of 1867 and 1884 not only to govern themselves at home, but also to guide the destinies of a great Empire, than in these days when the complexity of the issues looms more largely before our disillusioned eyes. But even at that time the 'leap in the dark' alarmed many of the most far-seeing, and great would have been their relief if they could have guessed that a long period of grace (a period, however, which might have been utilised to greater effect) was in store before the full results of these measures were to be felt. By a series of accidental circumstances, foremost among which was the split in the Liberal party over Home Rule in 1886, the Conservative forces of the country recovered more than all the ground they had lost under the brilliant charlatan who had led them to turn their back upon themselves, and for a long period of years a party inspired largely by moderate Liberal or Whig ideas had an opportunity of showing that there is an alternative, even in a democratically constituted State, to Radical and Socialist domination. No country perhaps was ever given such a chance of gradual evolution from an oligarchical to a popular *régime*. The steadying element from 1881 onward, as we shall see, was undoubtedly supplied by the moderate wing of the Liberal party which had been alienated by Mr. Gladstone's leadership, and of this wing the most active and most consistent member was Mr. Goschen;

The dissolution of 1874 was to mark the close of the first epoch of Mr. Goschen's political career. He was, though he little suspected it, never again to be a member of a Liberal Cabinet, but during a long period he was destined to stand outside the party circle, becoming by degrees more and more out of sympathy with the development of Liberal policy until he drifted into the Conservative camp. But though from being a strong Liberal he was to become the strongest of Unionists, there was singularly little break in the continuity of his political opinions; and the fact that in the course he took he only anticipated that taken not only by many of his Liberal colleagues but by thousands of Liberals of the rank and file throughout the country proves that the change which affected his position was the democratisation of the Liberal party rather than any serious alteration of his own standpoint.

Mr. Elliot well sums up his position at the close of the Parliament of 1868-1874. He describes Mr. Goschen

'as an ardent Liberal as Liberalism was understood in those days. His address to the electors of the City and his speeches on the eve of the elections were those of a strong party man. Yet in everything that he wrote or uttered there rang the note of an individualism amply sufficient to prove that he could never be accounted a mere "item" (to use an expression much in vogue a dozen years later) in party reckoning. His career had already shown that he took no mere surface view of the larger political issues before the country, that he had studied deeply the merits of political questions, that he was a master of detail, and that his political conclusions were those not of an ambitious self-seeker but of a conscientious and patriotic statesman.'

On questions of foreign policy he had shown from the days of his controversy with Cobden that he held a view of the position of Great Britain in Continental affairs which differed materially from that of the most numerous section of his own party, and which led his enemies in later days to describe him as a 'Jingo'; and during the last month of the Ministry he had, with his colleagues, at the War Office differed seriously with Mr. Gladstone, a difference which Lord Morley and Mr. Elliot agree in thinking the primary cause for the sudden dissolution of 1874, as to the provision which should be made for the maintenance of the defensive forces of the country.

The shifting of the centre of gravity caused by the lowering of the franchise was just beginning to make itself felt, and produced such ebullitions as the curious utterance on party loyalty from Sir William (then Mr.) Harcourt quoted in this book (vol. i. p. 152), and his vigorous public protests 'as a sound

'Whig, against the dangerous courses into which Mr. Gladstone 'seemed likely to lead the Liberal party!' Mr. Goschen said nothing though he may be supposed to have agreed; but a year or two later he published two anonymous articles, entitled 'The Leap in the Dark' and 'The New Electors,' which attracted much attention and which showed a much more philosophical appreciation of the trend of events. He commented on the nonchalance with which Ministers and Members of Parliament had accepted a change 'by which such a transfer 'of power was accomplished as was never made in any country 'except under the pressure of a revolution,' and he added the pregnant observation that people had, from an experience of Parliament in recent years, come to consider it as an actual humdrum machine, and 'did not realise what it is to be afraid 'of parliamentary action.' Deeply interesting and profoundly true, though the writer lived hardly long enough to see the full realisation of his anticipations, is the following summary of the probable characteristics of the new electorate. Mr. Goschen totally disbelieved in the Conservatism of the 'residuum,' and events are proving that he was right, though a combination of circumstances—the Conservative consolidation which sprang out of the rejection of Irish Home Rule, the growth of Imperial sentiment, the material prosperity of the country, the veneration which Queen Victoria's age and character inspired, and the patriotic enthusiasm temporarily aroused by the South African war—veiled and checked the democratic movement for an unexpected number of years.

'We believe that the new electorate will on the whole throw most of their weight on to the most Liberal side of the Liberal party; that they will attribute an importance to sentimental questions which these questions have not hitherto been able to secure; that as at home they will demand greater respect for the susceptibilities of their class, so abroad they will support rather the "cosmopolitan" than the dynastic element, and on condition of our foreign policy falling in with their sympathies, will be more ready to fight than existing constituencies; that in social questions they will require more vigorous action, a fiercer warfare against abuses, more Government interference; that in economical matters they will be less faithful to political economy; that in future they will be on the side of trade, rather than that of land; of direct, rather than of indirect, taxation; that they will be less chary of touching vested rights, and more exacting as to public utility; and that there may even be a tendency to take a somewhat different view of the right definition of National prosperity. An immense responsibility will rest on those Liberals whose strength the Reform Bill has most tended to increase.'

Although Mr. Goschen concluded with an expression of his belief that the accession of new vigour and new blood would be beneficial to Parliament and the country, he continued to deplore the changed attitude of public men and of the House of Commons towards financial and economic questions. In 1877, in the debate on Sir George Trevelyan's resolution pledging the Liberal party to the extension of the Household franchise to the counties, he made a remarkable speech (which Lord Hartington described as the most courageous he had ever heard in the House) in which he specially adverted to these considerations. Already he remarked that, even with the existing franchise, it was the newly enfranchised classes who had been especially favoured in legislation and at the same time financially spared. Already he had noticed a change in the House of Commons.

“It might be an unpopular thing to say it, but Political Economy had been dethroned in that House, and Philanthropy had been allowed to take its place. Political Economy was the bugbear of the working classes, and philanthropy, he was sorry to say, was their idol. In all legislative assemblies, wherever numbers and numbers alone had prevailed, the doctrines of political economy had never taken root.”

‘Modern Radicalism differed much, he went on to urge, from the Radicalism of former times. Nowadays Government was expected to lay its hand on every trade, to remedy abuses, and to adjust the relations between capital and labour; in short, Parliament was to do what older Radicals and political economists thought that men should do for themselves.

“It was the teaching of history that the reign of numbers endangered not the Throne, not the Constitution, not Property—these were all bugbears—but Political Economy and the teaching that made Englishmen self-reliant.”’

Such were the instincts and feelings which lay at the root of Mr. Goschen's opposition to a further extension of the franchise, an opposition to which he again gave expression in the following session, when the resolutions were again brought forward and supported by the whole Liberal party, with the exception of Mr. Lowe and himself. He did not conceal from himself the serious effect which this independent attitude might have upon his political future. Holding his convictions strongly he refused to subordinate them to personal or party considerations, and his action was alike honourable to himself and beneficial to the tone of public life. In these days, when considerations of the caucus order are so much stronger than they were then it is to be feared that such action would at once

have cut him off from membership of the party. As it was, he was still allowed for many years to represent a Liberal constituency in the House of Commons, and to exercise his considerable influence on the side of moderation in quarters where that influence was most needed. When the time came the consideration which he still enjoyed with the Liberal chiefs proved of the utmost value to the causes he had at heart; but apart from the question of conscience, of which every individual must judge for himself, it may be doubted whether those of Mr. Goschen's colleagues who sympathised with his general ideas, but whose Liberal faith was more robust and whose critical and introspective faculties were less acute, did not perform an even greater service by their more prolonged adhesion to their party.

It must not be supposed however that Mr. Goschen at this time contemplated severance from his party. He worked closely with Lord Hartington and Lord Granville during the years of Lord Beaconsfield's Ministry, when his attention was turned more and more towards foreign affairs, first by his mission to Cairo in 1876 on behalf of the bondholders, the opening step of the long-drawn Egyptian drama, and second by the events of the Russo-Turkish war which culminated in Lord Beaconsfield's 'Peace with Honour.' His diary vividly reflects the excitement and the hopes and fears which prevailed in English political society at this time; and his language throughout was hardly less condemnatory of the foreign policy of the Government with its 'swagger' and 'bombast' than Mr. Gladstone's own. As this Parliament neared its close he decided to retire from the representation of the City, largely in consequence of his dislike to minority representation, and after some negotiations was chosen as the Liberal candidate for Ripon, 'where he could fight a Tory opponent single-handed.' His election address still struck a strongly party Liberal note while maintaining his position on county suffrage; he considered that in their diplomatic devices the Government had been following un-English ways, and he disapproved of the bringing of Indian troops to Malta and of the annexation of Cyprus. 'I am frankly glad that Constantinople was kept out of Russian hands, but I deeply regret that the rising nationalities of the East were not taught to look to England as one of their staunchest friends, and that the claims of Greece are still unsatisfied.'

The great Liberal victory of 1880 placed Mr. Gladstone fresh from his triumphs in Midlothian again in power, and being unable owing to his attitude on the franchise question to include

Mr. Goschen in the Cabinet he made him the dazzling offer of the Viceroyalty of India. This Mr. Goschen refused, as he also did the Embassy at Constantinople, but he finally accepted a temporary mission to Turkey, as Ambassador Extraordinary, to settle the questions which had arisen in connexion with the fulfilment of the conditions imposed by the Treaty of Berlin.

The appointment was unpaid, and he was thus enabled to retain his seat in Parliament, an object which he had at heart. Mr. Goschen's successful conduct of this mission, was, perhaps, with his conversion of the National Debt, the most considerable practical achievement of his career, and will always testify to the high diplomatic skill which he possessed. He thoroughly enjoyed this taste of diplomatic life and the opportunity of intercourse with foreign statesmen, and especially with Bismarck, his interviews with whom are given in some deeply interesting pages; while his year's absence from the House of Commons saved him from participation in the early difficulties of the Government, those connected with Mr. Bradlaugh, with Majuba, and the Irish Land Bill. It was clear when he did return that his position in the new Parliament would be a new one, and that he would have a part to play in the situation produced by the now clearly indicated differences between the Whig or Moderate Liberals and the Radical extremists led by Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke. One thing at all events was certain, that whatever dissatisfaction Mr. Goschen was to feel with Mr. Gladstone's conduct of affairs, there was little to induce him to throw in his lot with the Opposition nominally led by Lord Salisbury and Sir Strafford Northcote, but harassed by the guerilla warfare of Lord Randolph Churchill, the darling of Tory democracy, who was on the look-out to make use in the interests of his party of the hostility between the Liberal Government and the Parnellites.

Mr. Goschen returned to London in time for the later stages of the Irish Land Bill, and on the Report stage of the Bill voted for Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice's motion to omit tenancies of over 100*l.* rental from its fair rent provisions. This action procured many expressions of sympathy from those opponents of the Bill who, like the Duke of Argyll, saw in it a derogation from all sound Liberal principle, and profoundly dissented from the new ideas of legislative interference with freedom of individual action. Such men now began to look upon Mr. Goschen as their future leader. He himself however was as far as possible from any idea of intriguing against the Government or working for their overthrow. In the course of the year 1892 he supported them in more than one powerful speech in the

country, and insisted that it was a matter of imperative national necessity to maintain Mr. Gladstone in office, and strengthen the hands of the executive Government in preserving order in Ireland.

‘The Liberal party,’ says Mr. Elliot, ‘was not composed only of extreme Radicals and stick-at-nothing-political partisans, but contained also a strong infusion of moderate and responsible men. The last thing he desired was to take these men out of the Liberal party and merge them with the Conservatives. But he did want, and he intended, that their views should not be ignored by Liberal statesmanship.’

So marked was his disapproval of the reckless Tory denunciation of the Government at a time when they had been forced to have recourse to coercive measures in Ireland, and of the obstructive methods of the Opposition in Parliament, that the time seemed to have arrived when he might have been supposed to be not unwilling to join the Ministry; and in June 1882 Mr. Gladstone, presuming that the difficulty as to county suffrage no longer stood in the way, offered him the post of Secretary of State for War. Mr. Goschen however, while cordially appreciating the offer, declined it, alleging that the ‘insurmountable barrier was still there.’ His remark long afterwards that ‘his opinions on so many matters were so ‘different from Gladstone’s that he could not with any ease have ‘accepted the post’ seems to indicate the real objection, especially as he admitted during the suffrage debate two years later that his distrust of the opinions and character of the new electorate had been largely removed by further experience.

The truth seems to be that he shunned the prospect of fighting out his differences with the Radical element in the Cabinet without the assurance of the Prime Minister’s support, and preferred to remain a powerful free lance. Moderate Liberals may well have regretted the decision, which was bound to lessen his chance of exerting a moderating influence within the party, and they could not yet see (nor would it have consoled them if they had done so) that the very fact of his growing alienation from Liberalism was by a fortunate accident to give him a few years later the opportunity of exerting the same moderating influence in the Conservative camp. But the party loss was perhaps in the end more than counterbalanced by circumstances which placed Mr. Goschen in a position to give effect to his political convictions during many years of high and responsible office.

Meanwhile, as a result of Mr. Goschen’s independent position,

the country had the advantage of his plain-spoken criticism and moderate counsels. Needless to say he stood heartily by the Government during the passage of the Prevention of Crimes Bill after the Phoenix Park Murders and supported them in their proposals for the closure and the reform of procedure in the House of Commons, while he was not ill-pleased with the general action of the Government as regards Egypt. In November 1883 Mr. Gladstone did his best to persuade Mr. Goschen to be put in nomination for the Speakership on the retirement of Speaker Brand. The project came to nothing owing to Mr. Goschen's shortsightedness, and only added another to the list of splendid posts which for one reason or another he was unable to accept. His friends were not ill-pleased, and one, 'a well-known member of Brooks's,' certainly expressed the general sentiment when he wrote 'I cannot help saying that, situated as we are between the Devil Chamberlain and the Deep Sea Salisbury, so good a man as yourself ought not to be wasted in the Chair.' Just before this incident he had at Edinburgh energetically vindicated his right to speak as a moderate Liberal to Liberals, and as good a member of the party as any advanced Radical.

'Mr. Chamberlain avowed that he was in favour of equal electoral districts, of paying members of Parliament, and of universal suffrage. He has the courage of his opinions, but I have the courage of mine, and I totally dissent from them.' Two days later he gave an address to the Philosophical Institution at the same place on '*Laissez Faire* and Government Interference' in which he restated his objection to the increasing tendency towards the performance by the State of duties for which the individual should be responsible.

One more utterance which throws light on Mr. Goschen's position at this time may be quoted, his famous refusal to give a 'political blank cheque to Lord Salisbury' on the vote of censure on the Egyptian policy of the Government at the opening of the session in 1884. Thenceforward the difficulties of the Government grew *crescendo*. Mr. Goschen unable to sympathise with either party, equally averse from the demagogism of Chamberlain and that of Churchill, disgusted with the mismanagement of the affairs of the country by the Government and by the 'general loosening, as he saw it, of belief in political principle and economic doctrine' ('the dethronement of orthodox political economy seemed likely to be signalled by the appearance of a swarm of quacks'), became, as he said, 'sometimes extremely low and heart broken'; and when the crash arrived on the 9th of June 1885 he stood, for a statesman

whose capacity, courage, and character were so generally recognised, singularly alone.

The fall of the Gladstone Cabinet which set its members free to express their own individual tendencies, and the manœuvring which now set in between the Radical section of the Liberal party on the one hand and Lord Randolph Churchill on the other to conciliate the Irish Nationalists, at all events to the extent of dropping coercion, almost immediately relieved Mr. Goschen from this position of isolation. He still recognised Mr. Gladstone as the Liberal leader and he had not broken with the Liberal party, but he was the 'most eminent of a 'considerable number of Liberals in Parliament and the country 'who viewed with profound distrust the Radicalism of Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke, and with detestation the 'policy of national disruption advocated by Mr. Parnell.' He was more than ever anxious that the anticipated Liberal victory of the coming general election should be won in the cause of moderate progress, and the freedom of his position and the unqualified and undisguised character of his opinions were now of the greatest advantage in constituting him the rallying point for those members of the party whose sentiments coincided with his own, but whose direct connexion with the late Government or the Liberal party had hitherto prevented them from coming forward. The relations between Mr. Goschen and the Whig leaders resumed all their former intimacy during the months preceding the election, at which he was returned as a Liberal by a triumphant majority over an advanced Radical for East Edinburgh. After the election which resulted in a British majority of eighty-six for Mr. Gladstone (the last of his great career), it became clear that the Nationalist demand for Home Rule must be answered one way or the other, for without the support of the eighty-six Parnellites Lord Salisbury could not remain in power for a single day. Events developed with startling rapidity, and the flying of the 'Hawarden Kite' brought out Lord Hartington with an address to his constituents declaring that he had in no way changed the opinions on the Irish question which he had expressed a few weeks before. This step Mr. Goschen, with whom he was in constant communication, strongly approved.

It is not our intention to follow the details of the events of the momentous Parliament opened on the 21st of January by the Queen in person, who had in the previous December put herself in direct communication with Mr. Goschen through Sir Henry Ponsonby in the interests of a 'junction of forces 'on a broad political basis between the more moderate

'politicians of each side,' and who, in the long correspondence which then ensued, placed great reliance on his patriotism and wisdom.

The story of the whole of that heroic struggle has never before, notwithstanding the numerous biographies which have appeared, been so fully told and illustrated from letters and from inside knowledge, and Mr. Elliot has treated it with a candour, a clearness, and a freedom from bitterness which deserve the highest praise. It is unlikely that the expected biography of the late Duke of Devonshire can add materially to our knowledge of this period, but it may be well to say here that Mr. Elliot takes the opportunity to remove the impression which has rather widely prevailed that it was Mr. Goschen's influence which induced Lord Hartington to break with his old leader. Mr. Goschen's more ardent nature and quicker intelligence no doubt supplied in counsel something that was lacking in Lord Hartington, but there was never a question of the latter's staunchness, much as it cost him to separate himself from the political and personal friendship of a lifetime.

'No one,' writes Mr. Elliot, 'who saw anything of Lord Hartington in December or January of that winter was left in the slightest doubt as to his opinions. He utterly condemned that Home Rule policy which with Mr. Gladstone's own consent was now being attributed to him. He knew Mr. Gladstone's real opinion, and to Mr. Gladstone his own opinions had been made known from the beginning. To a man of Lord Hartington's directness of character there must have been something almost repulsive in the repudiations that were being put forward on behalf of the Liberal Party that there was no intention whatever to tamper with the Legislative Union. Policy and methods he alike condemned. But Lord Hartington was essentially a practical statesman. If he were to oppose Mr. Gladstone and his policy, he would do so not merely with the object of "liberating his own soul," of freeing himself from the burden of responsibilities for the disastrous consequences that he believed would ensue, of making an honourable but vain protest against the inevitable. If he was to repudiate the Home Rule policy, he felt that he would make himself responsible for governing Ireland without it. Lord Hartington always saw the facts of a situation as they were, undistorted by his own wishes, interests or prejudices. No statesman was ever less of a doctrinaire. Whilst holding strongly to his political principles, he always had regard to the consequences which would follow political action. "Are you prepared," he said to those who consulted him at this stage of the controversy, "not merely to condemn Home Rule but to face the necessary consequences of its rejection? We have to carry British opinion with us." The result was to show that not a few of those who honestly disliked and disapproved of Home

Rule had not truly counted the cost of fighting it, and they, in the severity and strain of the coming struggle, succumbed to what their fears made them regard as inevitable.'

Of all the statesmen, it may be added, on either side with whom Mr. Goschen was brought into intimate association Lord Hartington was the one for whom he felt the fullest sympathy and admiration throughout his career.

Under the stress of this great controversy Mr. Goschen developed, as indeed was the case with many other public men, a higher degree of energy, enthusiasm, and oratorical power than he had been previously known to possess, not only in the House of Commons but in the country. The great gathering at the Opera House, after the first reading of the Home Rule Bill when Mr. Goschen had riddled Mr. Gladstone's proposals 'by detailed examination and pertinent questioning,' the meeting at which Lord Cowper presided with Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington on either hand, and which marked the birth of the 'Unionist' party destined for twenty years to dominate the political situation, was perhaps the culminating point of Mr. Goschen's exertions; and in seconding the resolution moved by Lord Salisbury his scornful eloquence brought down the house, and his exclamation in answer to threats of violence, 'We shall make our wills and do our duty,' was a call to arms which remains historical.

We must now pass to the next stage of Mr. Goschen's career—that which transformed him, on Lord Randolph's sensational resignation in December 1886, into the Chancellor of the Exchequer of a purely Conservative Administration, supported, however, from outside by the Liberal Unionist party. Complete coalition had been decided against by Lord Hartington and his friends on sufficient grounds which need not here be discussed, and Lord Hartington had declined on more than one occasion either to join Lord Salisbury or to accept the Premiership for himself. It need hardly be said that Mr. Goschen did not take this step, after Lord Hartington had finally declined the offers made to himself, without deep consideration.

'I have never had a more difficult choice to make,' he wrote to Mr. Elliot, 'but I am glad now that I have acted as I have done, and I may say that Hartington urged it on me. The fear was that the Government would go to pieces unless it was strengthened, and the collapse of the Government might have led to the worst results. This I think was Hartington's deciding motive. . .'

Those who clung to the idea of a reconstruction of the Liberal

party on Unionist lines—a by no means impossible contingency in the case of Mr. Gladstone's retirement from the political scene—naturally deplored the withdrawal of their foremost champion from the Liberal ranks. For such indeed it was, though Mr. Goschen entered the Cabinet as a Liberal Unionist and without severing himself from his Liberal clubs and associations. But to most people, and to the more Radical Unionists especially, who had by this time come to look on him in Lord Northbrook's words 'as hardly 'a Liberal at all,' the decision appeared eminently wise and suitable even from the personal point of view. Here at all events was one of the foremost statesmen and administrators in the country, peculiarly qualified for the part he was called on to fill, no longer to be withheld from the service of his country, and one whose inclusion in the Government secured communication and harmony of action with its Liberal Unionist allies. Looking to the condition of things at the moment, the overtures of Mr. Chamberlain to the Gladstonian leaders, and the resentment of the still powerful Tory democratic leader, Lord Randolph Churchill ('You and I,' wrote Mr. Chamberlain to the latter, 'are equally adrift from the old organisations'), it is difficult to see how in any other way but by Mr. Goschen's decisive action on this occasion the fruits of the Unionist victory in the country over the forces of separation could have been secured. Many will remember the utter, and as it seemed almost inexplicable, want of confidence which prevailed during the year 1887 in Conservative and Unionist ranks. The Conservatives had long been out of office, they were without proved administrative talent, and they had been demoralised by the intriguing spirit which had so long prevailed among them. It is not too much to say that Mr. Goschen's adhesion gave them, for the time at all events, the stability and regard for principle in politics which they had so largely lost, and it is perhaps one of the greatest triumphs of Whiggism that it should thus have invigorated and inspired the Conservative party and enabled it to carry on the Government of the country for many years on lines which were at once moderate and enlightened. If Mr. Goschen's dream of indoctrinating the Liberal party with his ideas of 'moderate' policy had failed, he had at least the satisfaction of seeing them adopted by a transformed Conservative party, and the good fortune to work as a leading member of one of the most successful and beneficial administrations of modern times.

As Chancellor of the Exchequer for six years—a spell of office few people anticipated at the start—Mr. Goschen was

given an opportunity which has seldom fallen to the lot of so trained and skilful a financier and economist. He had never lost touch with the City, and on questions of currency, banking, and the like he had always taken a leading part in Parliament. The conditions prevailing in the City at the time of the failure of Overend and Gurney and the collapse of credit at that crisis had led him to discuss in this Journal, in January 1865 and 1868, the problem of 'Dear' and 'Cheap' money,* the effect of the new system of limited liability and the principle underlying Peel's Bank Charter Act. He had represented the Bondholders in Egypt in 1876, and in 1878 had acted as a British representative at an international monetary Conference at Paris, and the question of the appreciation of gold, which had for years been the bugbear of the Indian Government, had formed the subject of a speech which attracted much attention in 1883. His first Budget speech, which took three hours in delivery, showed in every sentence an individuality of treatment and a mastery of all parts of his subject which only a lifelong experience of, and instinct for, financial matters could explain. His speeches abound in expositions of intricate and technical financial details which Mr. Gladstone in his best days alone rivalled, and are studded with interesting discussions, such as his analysis in one Budget speech of the profits of various trades and professions based on the income-tax assessments; estimates of the value of the 'retail trade which permeates every village in the country, the great home trade which does not always strike our attention so much as the more important and visible trades'; his account in another of the basis on which he estimated his revenue, of which Mr. Gladstone remarked in praising it that he 'did not think he had ever known that department of the statement of the Finance Minister so much expanded'; his deductions as to the distribution of income among the different classes of income-tax payers derived from the income-tax returns. In all such discussions he showed himself a practical economist of a high order and a master of the statistical method. The conversion of the National Debt in the second year of office—that great operation the success of which was due to his financial knowledge and diplomatic skill—has been criticised on account of results, due to other causes, which have been wrongly attributed to it; but it will give permanent lustre to his reign at the

* These articles, 'Seven per Cent.' and 'Two per Cent.,' were republished by Lord Goschen in 1905 in his 'Essays and Addresses on Economic Questions.'

Treasury, and his handling of the Baring crisis largely contributed to staving off what might have proved a world-wide disaster. But when it comes to his dealings with taxation proper and to the actual construction of his successive Budgets his performance must be held to have fallen short of the great expectations which his reputation encouraged.

The arguments for and against his successive reductions of the Sinking Fund were nicely balanced, and Mr. Goschen convinced himself of the unwisdom of 'stringing our bow 'too tight' and maintaining taxation at an unreasonable height for the purpose of repayment of debt. But in view of all that has happened since it is difficult to deny that his opponents were right when they spoke of 'the danger of 'blunting a great financial weapon which should be held in 'reserve for a time of emergency,' or that Lord Randolph Churchill's ironical lamentations over the 'fall' of 'the orthodox 'apostle, the canonised saint of financial purity,' had some justification.

So again with the incomet-ax. Mr. Goschen never ceased to deplore the pressure of this tax upon the poorer income-tax payers, and upon earned and professional incomes. But his only remedy was to reduce the tax upon rich and poor alike. His treatment of the relations between direct and indirect taxation was certainly a departure from previous fiscal traditions. He showed little sympathy towards the growing demand for the reduction of the indirect imposts which affect the poorest classes. He was the first of modern Chancellors of the Exchequer to raise the cry that the basis of our taxation was dangerously narrow, and he continually harped on the inelasticity of the main props of our revenue. 'I say, and I say it with 'some trepidation and knowing the enormous difficulty which the discovery of new sources of taxation involves, that it is 'better service to the State to increase the number of the 'sources of the revenue than to attempt to find simplicity.' Sir William Harcourt described this, with reason, as one of the 'most alarming sentiments he had ever heard,' and as a complete reversal of the principles of general taxation which had been accepted with so much beneficial effect since Sir Robert Peel's days. Nor does subsequent financial history support Mr. Goschen's fears of diminishing revenue. He failed to foresee the immense developement of which the direct taxes were susceptible and the ease with which a great increase of revenue might be obtained from the existing indirect taxes, as was proved during the South African War. His forecasts were falsified even during his own Chancellorship in these respects.

It may with truth be said that he excelled in ingenuity in meeting demands for revenue from many quarters at once, and in efforts to discover fresh sources of taxation without having recourse to taxation levied on the one hand upon articles of universal consumption nor, on the other, upon the earnings of business or professional men ; but the most salient result of the opinions he held on these subjects was to complicate his financial statements almost to distraction by a multitude of small changes. He showed in his first Budget speech how fully he appreciated the necessity of reorganisation in the chief taxes, death duties, income-tax, stamp duties and the rest, and of an analysis of the incidence of taxation upon different classes ; but he did not succeed in handling any of these problems in more than a tentative, partial and piecemeal fashion. His arrangements as regard loans for imperial and naval defence Acts were so elaborate that they only puzzled the House of Commons, confused the public accounts, and gave colour to the accusation that had it not been for borrowing he would have had deficits instead of a series of magnificent surpluses. Even in local taxation, a subject on which he was a recognised expert, the arrangements he made have not produced the final settlement at which he aimed. He no doubt intended that the several duties allocated to local purposes should be finally sundered from imperial finance and be regarded as local taxes. But they were still to be levied and only alterable by Parliament : and as a matter of fact it was found impossible to disentangle them from the Budget. Ingenious as it appeared, the new scheme was based on a fallacy in so far as it was imagined that the earmarking of particular taxes, or a portion of them, and paying them to other accounts on their way to the Exchequer, would be more beneficial to the taxpayers than withdrawing so many millions from the Exchequer for the relief of the ratepayers. The change would indeed have justified itself if the assignment of specific revenues, as Mr. Goschen no doubt hoped, had put a stop to further demands for the relief of ratepayers. As a matter of fact it has proved the starting point for a fresh developement of the vicious system of grants-in-aid under a new name. In the long-drawn duel between Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Goschen, between the amateur and the professional financier, on such points as these, the former seems to us to have taken the sounder view ; and though Mr. Goschen accomplished a great work in providing for the growing needs of his day, for free education, for a reformed system of local Government, for a largely increased expenditure on the defensive forces of the country and especially the navy, without

throwing an appreciably heavier burden on the taxpayers of the country, it may perhaps be admitted that he did not do so much as might have been hoped to realise the ideal which Lord Randolph Churchill set before himself and to raise the financial reputation of the Conservative party from the 'very low point at which it had stood since the time of Sir Robert Peel.' It must be remembered, however, that while the complicated ingenuity of his Budgets was no doubt characteristic of his intellectual processes he had a very difficult political game to play, and that he could not afford to endanger the Union by running the risk of alienating the support of the Conservative party by the more drastic financial reforms at which he sometimes hinted in his speeches.

We must pass over somewhat rapidly that portion of Lord Goschen's career which remained after this culminating point had been reached. It is still within the memory of all who follow political affairs. He might well have looked to the leadership of the House of Commons on the death of Mr. W. H. Smith, one of the most popular and respected members who ever filled that high position. If the vacancy had occurred two or three years earlier he would certainly have been chosen for it. But in the meantime Mr. Balfour's Irish administration had brought him to the front, and there was a growing feeling in the Conservative party that in view of an imminent dissolution of Parliament the leadership should not fall to one who was not yet a member of the Carlton Club, even though, as Lord Salisbury admitted, he was more of a Conservative in the true sense than some of his Cabinet colleagues.

Before the Unionists again returned to power after the short interval (1892-1895) of a Liberal and Home Rule Government, Mr. Goschen had with the approval of the Duke of Devonshire joined the Carlton, leaving the Liberal Unionist leadership in the Commons to Mr. Chamberlain, and it was as a Conservative that he sat in the Coalition Ministry during the Parliament of 1895 to 1900. He returned this time to his old post at the Admiralty, and to five years of the most valuable work he ever did in his life. The period was full of alarms and of foreign complications; Venezuela, the Krüger telegram, Fashoda, Port Arthur, threatened our relations in turn with every one of the Great Powers; and it was only Lord Salisbury's dexterous and patient diplomacy, backed by overwhelming naval strength, which brought the country safely through. When peace was at last broken by the Boer War the command of the sea was the factor which alone enabled the war to be brought to a successful conclusion. Never was the truth more

clearly demonstrated that adequate and even excessive preparation for war, if made in time, is the cheapest policy in the end. Probably not one of Mr. Goschen's colleagues would have had the authority which enabled him to raise naval expenditure from the 18½ millions as it stood in 1896 to the 27½ millions, besides two millions on naval works, nearly 30 millions in all, which it reached in 1900; for as an ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer he knew the importance of economy, and he could be trusted to get proper value for the vast sum he expended. Not only this, but he was known to be, after the Prime Minister himself, the member of the Cabinet who was 'best acquainted' with foreign affairs and the relations towards us and *inter se* 'of the continental nations.' It was a fortunate circumstance for this country that one of the strongest, ablest, and most patriotic of her statesmen should have held this particular post during a critical time.

When after thirty-seven years of continuous parliamentary work he decided, on the approach of the so-called 'Khaki' election, that the time had come for him to retire from office and accept a peerage, an honour never more worthily bestowed, no one could have anticipated that another urgent call to arms would find him still in the forefront of the battle; and that the Unionist party, built up so largely by his efforts, was on the eve of disruption. There is something curiously dramatic in the varying personal relations of Lord Goschen and Mr. Chamberlain. Nothing but a political convulsion of the first magnitude could have brought together two statesmen so anti-pathetic in their political training and outlook and enabled them to work in outward harmony, and even to sit in the same Cabinet for a long series of years. It was no less singular that another turn of the wheel should have sundered these relations and made them protagonists on opposite sides in a struggle not less momentous than the first. To many readers the concluding chapters of this book will be of more captivating interest than the rest. For in them Mr. Elliot gives us the story, again at first hand and from personal knowledge, of the Unionist stand against the Protectionist reaction, a stand in which Lord Goschen played the leading part until his death in February 1907. In none of the controversies in which he had been engaged did he take a more honourable or more influential share. He had, as he said, been a 'Missionary of Empire' but always a Free Trader; and Free Trade with him, like his other economic opinions, was not a matter of doctrinaire prejudice but the result of thought and observation. 'I have worked out these problems for myself' he told the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce in 1903. 'I have been a

'patient observer of commercial, banking and trade affairs, 'and it is from that point of view I speak to you as a business 'man.'

He was not content to repeat without verification the opinions he had always held, and when the question was first raised he set himself with the energy which younger men do not often show to bring his knowledge up to date and test his opinions by the study of all the recent authorities and fresh statistics he could lay hands upon. When he spoke, therefore, it was with a weight of argument and a wealth of illustration which carried all before it and pulverised Mr. Chamberlain's case; and the very fact which Mr. Elliot notes that 'he had no wish to bring 'recruits to Radicalism' and that he spoke from the point of view of one who had done with office and was bent on maintaining a 'non-party and non-electioneering attitude,' gave all the greater force to his endeavours to enlighten the 'political 'quackery, as he thought it, by which it was attempted to 'delude the people into accepting a policy most injurious to the 'interests of the nation and the empire.' From the day in June 1903 when he raised the question of preferential tariffs in the House of Lords and struck the keynote of the coming discussion (as he had done on more than one former occasion) in a striking epigrammatic phrase—'It is a gamble in the food of the 'people'—down to the election of 1906 when Free Trade had been 'saved' (as the Duke of Devonshire remarked 'for the 'present'), his speeches weighed, as the same statesman said, 'almost more in the public mind than those of any other man.' It has not often in English history been given to a public man to carry on to the end of his life an activity so beneficial to his countrymen and so fortunate in the public esteem which he increasingly enjoyed.

Of Lord Goschen's characteristics as a statesman the foregoing notes on his career will perhaps have given some idea. He was cautious, astute, ambitious, analytical, with a razor-like quickness of intellect; but he joined to these qualities others which are not often allied to them: devotion to principles, courage in asserting them, personal disinterestedness and high-mindedness, and consistency in action—qualities which do not always secure their reward in public life but which always elevate and adorn it. 'In politics,' wrote his friend Mr. Arthur Butler, 'he was a strong Liberal of the left 'centre, and he claimed that he had never abandoned this 'position, even when he had joined the Carlton.' The claim is just, though a 'conservative unwillingness to change increased 'with advancing years.' He was a thoroughly loyal colleague,

but his love of detail, his critical attitude towards his subordinates, and his manner of balancing till the latest moment the pros and cons of any particular course made him a somewhat exacting chief in official life. His caution, his sensitiveness, and the moderation of his opinions disguised feelings of unusual depth and strength, and his nature was the very reverse of phlegmatic. The words 'furious' and 'angry' often recur in his letters and diaries, and he might, like Montlosier, have been described as one 'qui aimait la sagesse avec folie et la 'modération avec transport.' Two things specially, observes Mr. Elliot, provoked him to indignation when he thought he perceived them :

'the setting class against class and the manifestation of indifference to the greatness and power of the nation.' He was in short 'at the same time a moderate man and a fighting man,' and he 'aspired not unsuccessfully to make moderation a force.'

No combination of qualities is rarer, and none could conceivably be of greater use in a democratic state.

Of Lord Goschen's private and domestic relations Mr. Elliot gives a most attractive account. His houses, whether in London or the country, were real homes where family life was seen at its best. Those who had known him only in official life were sometimes surprised to find at Seacox Heath the best and most genial of hosts—gay, cheerful, and courteous with old and young alike. 'There was indeed no society in which he 'was not the best of company, and no one appreciated or told 'a good story better than himself.' His retentive memory, his wide cultivation, his interest in men and things, made him a most brilliant talker; he drew around him as his friends the best and most distinguished men and women of his day, and he was a member of many of those clubs and inner social coteries such as the Cosmopolitan, the Breakfast Club, and Grillion's, to which political eminence alone is no sufficient or certain passport. It is well that these traits and attributes—the human side of the great statesman—should have been treated so fully and sympathetically as they are in these volumes, for without them no true picture of the man would have been possible, and the memory of them is far more fleeting than that of political achievements and public services.

INDEX

A.

'*Army Training, Memorandum on*' reviewed, 321.

Asquith, Right Hon. Herbert H., 'Speech at Hull (November 25, 1910)' reviewed, 255.

B.

Balfour, Right Hon. Arthur, 'Speeches at Nottingham (November 17, 1910) and Albert Hall (November 29, 1910)' reviewed, 255.

Ballad Art, Modern Developments in, 153—definition of ballad form, 153 f.—Professor Ker's 'Epic and Romance,' 154—varying ballad forms, 155—the imitative ballad, 156—Sir Walter Scott, 157 f.—Southey, 158 f.—Goethe's 'Erlkönig' 159—commemorative ballads, 160—Campbell's 'Pattle of the Baltic,' 161—'Burial of Sir John Moore at Corunna,' 162—Longfellow's 'Paul Revere's Ride,' 163—the Scandinavian narrative cycle, 164—Longfellow's 'Ballad of Carmilhan,' 166—Tennyson's 'Sir Galahad,' 167 f.—his 'Lady of Shalott,' 168—William Morris, 169 f.—Dante Gabriel Rossetti, 171 f.—Rossetti's *Lilith*, 173—the ballad-idiyll, 174—Heine's 'Alte Lied,' 175—R. Browning's 'Dramatic Romances,' 176—John Davidson's 'Ballads and Songs,' 177—'Ballad of Reading Gaol,' 178.

Barbary Corsairs, The, 443—Turkey and the Levantine corsairs, 444—Turkish fleet recruited from corsairs, 445—the brothers Barbarossa, 446—battle of Lepanto, 446—attractions of the corsairs' calling, 447—Sir Francis Verney, 448—inability of the Porte to cope with piracy, 449—slave trade in Algiers, 450—French fleets sent against Algerian pirates, 451 f.—Dutch expedition, 452—Admiral Blake at Porto Farina, 453—Sir Edward Spragge at Bougie, 454—Tangier abandoned by English, 455—right of searching European ships for contraband, 456—Lord Winchilsea on Turkish attitude, 457—Sir John Finch on French engagement at Chios, 458—Spanish and Italian attempts to subdue piracy, 460—Dutch-Algerian treaty (1726), 461—Danish expedition in 1770, 462—Biserta bombarded, 463—attitude of Napoleon and Nelson towards Algiers, 464—action of United States of America, 465—Lord Exmouth's mission, 465 f.—Algiers occupied by the French, 467.

Bateson, W., 'Mendel's Principles of Heredity' reviewed, 77.

Biddulph of Ledbury, The Lady, 'Charles Philip Yorke, Fourth Earl of Hardwicke, Vice-Admiral R.N.' reviewed, 443.

Blennerhassett, Lady, 'Marie Stuart' reviewed, 200.

'Board of Education, *University Reports for 1908-9*' reviewed, 57.
Bower, F. O., Sc.D., F.R.S., 'The Origin of a Land Flora' reviewed, 299.

British Army and Modern Conceptions of War, The, 321—the Boer War, 321 f.—views of General Langois, 322—General Kuropatkin quoted, 323 f.—continental critics, 324—Mr. Haldane and army reform, 325—the Franco-German War and its lesson, 326—Karl von Clausewitz, 327—the commander-in-chief and column commanders, 329—Napoleon's policy of husbanding his forces, 330—selection of column and time for wing attack, 331—French and German methods of attack, 332—work of the Historical Section of the General Staffs of France and Germany, 333—Official History of the Russo-Japanese War, 334 f.—Japanese army trained on German lines, 336 f.—tactics at Liao Yang, 337—Russian incapacity in Manchuria, 338—criticism of British Official History, 339—French and German comments on battle of Te-li-ssu, 340—Herr von Donat's 'The Russo-Japanese War,' 341—'Memorandum on Army Training' quoted, 341 f.—summary of the attitude of our General Staff, 343—General Wilson on 'Initiative and the Power of Manœuvre,' 344 f.—conclusions arrived at, 346.

Brown, G. Baldwin, 'The Care of Ancient Monuments' reviewed, 370.

C.

Campbell, Douglas Houghton, Ph.D., 'Lectures on Evolution of Plants' and 'The Structure and Development of Mosses and Ferns' reviewed, 299.

Conflict of Colour, The, 419—annexation of the Punjab, 419—effect of American Revolution on Britain, 420 f.—distribution and changes of colour in America, 422—political relations between Europe and Asia, 423—Japanese policy towards China, 424—Anglo-Japanese treaties, 425—The Boxer insurrection and the Russo-Japanese War, 426—Anglo-Russian Convention (1907) 427—India is the key to Nearer Asia, 428—Mr. Meredith Townsend and the Sepoy revolt, 429 f.—reforms of Mr. G. K. Gokhale, 430—education of Indian administrators, 431—external relations of India, 432—policy of England and Russia in India, 433—Turkey and Egypt, 433—the Black problem, 434—Abbé Dubois quoted, 435—constitutionalism in Turkey, 437—growing unrest in Asia, 438—effects of Russo-Japanese War summarized, 439 f.—H. Chamberlain and John Stuart Mill on race distinction, 441—Charles Pearson's 'National Life and Character,' 442.

'*Corstopitum, Reports of the Excavations, 1907-9*' reviewed, 468.

- Cost of Living of the Working Classes, The*, 131—'Les Ouvriers Européens,' 131—Fiscal Blue Books, 132—difficulty of arriving at true expenditure, 133—London and Provincial rents, 134—rents in Scotland and Ireland, 135—flour and bread, 136—average number of children living at home, 136—average consumption of working-class family, 137—local variations in wages, 138—rents in Germany, 139—price of provisions in Germany, 140—average consumption in Germany, 141—annual expenditure, 143—rents in France, 144—number of children and expenditure in France, 145—average consumption, 146—rents in Belgium, 147—average income and consumption in Belgium, 148—'The Common Sense of Political Economy,' 149—standard of comfort, 150—general increase in prices, 151—complete returns essential for comparison, 152.
- '*Cost of Living of the Working Classes.*' Report of Board of Trade Enquiry reviewed, 131.
- Cromer, Earl of*, 'Ancient and Modern Imperialism' reviewed, 106.
- Curle, James*, 'A Roman Frontier Post and its People: the Fort of Newstead in the Parish of Melrose' reviewed, 468.
- Currey, Commander E. Hamilton*, 'Sea-Wolves of the Mediterranean: the Grand Period of the Moslem Corsairs' reviewed, 443.
- Cust, Lionel*, 'Authentic Portraits of Mary Queen of Scots' reviewed, 200.

D.

- Davidson, John*, 'Ballads and Songs,' 'New Ballads,' and 'The Last Ballad' reviewed, 153.
- '*Democratic Campaign Book for 1910*' reviewed, 32.
- Descriptive Sociology*, 392—Herbert Spencer's assistants in compilation of 'Principles of Sociology,' 393—appreciation of E. T. C. Werner, 394—and of Drs. Mahaffy and Golligher, 395—method of classification, 395—difficulty in arriving at original point of view, 396—social institutions are indexes to the character of men, 397—political institutions, 398 f.—ceremonial institutions, 399 f.—Professor Westermarck on clothing, 400—interchangeability of emotions, 400—religious emotions, 401—J. H. Fabre's 'Mœurs des Insectes,' 402—in investigating conduct we must look for true motive, 403—intellectual capacity of primitive man, 404—his feelings of obedience and reverence, 405—the emotions of a community are portrayed in their gods, 406—Mr. Keary's 'Pursuit of Reason,' 407 f.—emotional traits of the Chinese, 408 f.—those of the Greeks, 409 f.—dawn of philosophy in Greece, 411—Pythagorean theory of number, 412—Heraclitus and Anaxagoras, 413—Democritus and Protagoras, 414—Socrates, 415 f.—Antisthenes and Diogenes, 416 f.—Plato, 417—qualifications for the study of sociology, 418.
- Ditchfield, P. H.*, 'Vanishing England' reviewed, 370.

Donat, Karl von, his translation of 'The Russo-Japanese War' reviewed, 321.

Duchesse du Maine and her Court, The, 491—her family, 492—her restless spirit in youth, 493—Madame de Maintenon, 493—marriage of Duc du Maine, 494—his tastes and character, 495—fitful studies of Madame du Maine, 496—matrimonial differences, 497—Nicolas de Malézieu, 498—Abbé Genest, 499—love of amusement, 500—Mouche à Miel, 501—the Barony of Sceaux 501 f.—Pavillon de l'Aurore, 503—Lagrange Chancel, 504—Cardinal de Polignac and Fontenelle, 505—Marquis de Sainte-Aulaire, 506—Voltaire, 507—Madame de Staal, 508—'L'Engoûment' and 'La Mode,' 509—Grandes Nuits, 510—political aspirations of the Duchesse du Maine, 511—death of Louis XIV, 512—conspiracy of Cellamare, 513—Château de Sceaux becomes the centre of discontent, 514—Duchesse du Maine imprisoned, 515—her return to Sceaux, 516—Voltaire's activity at Sceaux, 517—Madame de Deffand, 518—Madame de Lambert, 519—Château of Anet, 520—death of the Duchesse du Maine, 521.

E.

Elliot, The Hon. A. D., 'The Life of George Joachim Goschen, First Viscount Goschen (1831-1907)' reviewed, 523.

English Prosody, choice of title, 1—Guest's 'History of English Rhythms' compared with Prof. Saintsbury's work, 2—feet with equivalence, 3—examples of enjambment in Chaucer, 4—Prof. Courthope's 'History of English Poetry,' 5—Wright's 'Political Poems,' 6—origins of metric poetry in English, 7—'Romance' and 'Geste,' 8—'Troilus and Criseyde' quoted, 9—Sidney Lee's 'The French Renaissance in England,' 10—French ballads, 11—Spenser and blank verse, 12—Shakespeare's Sonnets, 13—Théodore de Banville's 'Traité de Versification,' 14—harshness in Shakespearean couplet, 14—blank verse of dramatists, 15—equivalence and enjambment, 15—pauses and alliteration, 16—Marlowe and Shakespeare compared, 17 f.—Spenser's 'Prothalamion' quoted, 19—'Richard II,' 20—the redundant syllable in blank verse, 21—Saintsbury's neglect of Wordsworth, 22—Wordsworth as an ode writer, 23—Gray and Wordsworth compared, 24—Keats and Romanticism, 25—'Cymbeline' and Milton quoted, 26—influence of Keats on modern verse, 27—appreciation of Swinburne, 27 f.—Kipling and Newbolt, 29—'In Memoriam' metre, 30—Tennyson and Browning, 30.

English Universities, The State and the Freedom of, 57—main questions to be answered, 57—functions of a university, 58—Board of Education, 59—relationship of Universities to the State, 60 f.—Oxford and Cambridge, 61—their influence, 62—character of new universities, 63—State patronage, 64—grants from Exchequer,

65—relation of the State to Universities, 66—the King at Sheffield University and Cardiff, 67—Cardinal Newman's 'Idea of a University,' 68—freedom in University government, 69—Mr. Runciman and Mr. Lloyd George on independence, 70—the State and general inspection and control, 71—the work of the Board of Education, 72 f.—Sir William Anson and Sir Isambard Owen, 74—should grants be administered by Board of Education alone? 75—democratic control, 76.

European Dominion in Asia, 106—Mr. Bevan's 'History of the House of Seleucus,' 107—distinction between Eastern and Western civilisation, 108—Mr. Finlay's 'Greece under the Romans,' 108 f.—Comte de Gobineau's 'Trois Ans en Perse,' 110—Gobineau on English rule in India, 111—Seleucid and Roman empires in Asia, 112—criticism of Lord Cromer's 'Essay on Ancient and Modern Imperialism,' 113—Roman Imperialism in Europe,—114 W. Arnold's 'Studies of Roman Imperialism,' 115—influence of Russia in Asia, 116—Mr. J. Bryce's 'Studies in History and Jurisprudence,' 117—national prosperity of India due to association with Britain, 118—Macaulay and educational reform in India, 119—politics and literature in India, 120—language difficulty in India, 121—Government posts, 122—open examinations in China, 123—Western influence on China and India compared, 124—Mahaffy's 'Progress of Hellenism,' 125—'Prince of Destiny,' 126 f.—'Hindupore,' 128 f.—summary. 130.

F.

'*Field Service Regulations: Part I. Operations*' reviewed, 321.
Fisher, H. A. L., 'The History of England from the Accession of Henry VII to the death of Henry VIII (1485-1547)' reviewed, 229.

G.

'*German Army. Tendencies in the*' reviewed, 321.
Ghose, Sarath Kumar, 'The Prince of Destiny' reviewed, 106.
de Gobineau, Comte, 'Trois Ans en Perse' reviewed, 106.
Goligher, W. A.: see *Mahaffy, J. P.*

H.

Hart, David Berry, 'Phases of Evolution and Heredity' reviewed, 77.
Henderson, T. F., 'The Casket Letters and Mary Queen of Scots' reviewed, 200.
Heredity, The Principles of, 77—Montaigne's 'Of the resemblance between children and fathers,' 78—single-celled monads, 79—earliest form of sexual reproduction, 80—difference between protozoa and metazoa, 81—soma-plasm and germ-plasm, 82—gill-slits in human foetus, 83—diffusion and re-integration of the germ-plasm, 84—the germ-plasm of a species, 85—Dr. Archdall

Reid and the automaton hypothesis, 86—criticism of Dr. Reid's literary style, 87—inheritance of acquired characters, 88—Dr. Reid on evolution, 89—diseases peculiar to certain races, 90 f.—introduction of syphilis into Uganda, 91—effects of endemic and epidemic disease, 92—alcoholism, 93—opium habit, 94—natural selection and its exponents, 95—statistical and analytical methods of investigation, 96—Dr. Hart's 'Phases of Evolution and Heredity,' 97 f.—Professor Bateson's 'Mendel's Principles of Heredity,' 98 f.—eye-colour in man, 99—hair-colour and albinism, 100—the school of eugenics and selection, 101—marriage of the unfit, 102—association of genius with disease, 103—superfluous energy and its outlets, 104.

Historical Monuments of Great Britain and their Illustration in Hertfordshire and Berwick, The, 370—Ancient Monuments Protection Bill (1900), 370—inspector of ancient monuments appointed, 371—Royal Commissions on Monuments, 372—pleas for protection, 373—Reports on Berwick and Montgomery, 374—Dryburgh Abbey, 374—Fast Castle and Nisbet House, 375—Report on Sutherland and Inventory of Hertfordshire, 376—'The Care of Ancient Monuments' quoted, 377—camp on Penmaenmawr, 378—compulsory purchase of historical monuments, 379—Abbots Langley, 380 f.—Eleanor Cross at Waltham, 382—preservation of national monuments in Belgium and France, 383—'The History and Antiquities of the County of Hertford,' 383—St. Albans, 384 f.—Church of St. Mary at Hemel Hempstead, 386—Hatfield, 386—Gorhambury, 387 f.—Brookmans, 389—Rye House, 389—Great Bed of Ware, 390—Panshanger and Brocket, 390—Knebworth, Welwyn and Mackezeye End, 391.

K.

Keary, C. F., M.A., 'The Pursuit of Reason' reviewed, 347.
Kuropatkin, General, 'The Russian Army and the Japanese War' reviewed, 321.

L.

Lang, Andrew, 'The Mystery of Mary Stuart' reviewed, 200.
Lansdowne, Marquis of, 'Speech at Glasgow (November 25, 1910)' reviewed, 255.
Lord Goschen, 523—methods of writing a biography, 523—William Henry Goschen, 525—George Goschen at Rugby, 525 f.—at Oxford, 526 f.—becomes partner in Frühling & Göschen, 527—'Theory of Foreign Exchanges,' 528—Goschen's introduction to political life, 528—becomes a Cabinet Minister, 530—Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright, 531—fall of the Derby-Disraeli Ministry, 532—Goschen becomes First Lord of the Admiralty under Gladstone, 533—Home Rule split in 1886, 534—Goschen's foreign policy, 535—his views on the extension of Household Franchise, 537—mission to Turkey, 539—the Irish Land Bill, 539—office of Secre-

tary of State for War declined, 540—Prevention of Crimes Bill, 541—fall of the Gladstone Cabinet, 542—Lord Hartington, 543 f.—birth of Unionist party, 544—Goschen becomes Chancellor of the Exchequer, 545—‘Essays and Addresses on Economic Questions,’ 546—direct and indirect taxation, 547—Sir William Harcourt, 548—Goschen joins the Carlton Club, 549—Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Goschen, 550—Goschen’s views on Protection, 551—his private and domestic relations, 552.

M.

- Macdonald, George*, ‘The Roman Wall in Scotland’ reviewed, 468.
Macdonald, J. George, and Park, Alexander, ‘The Roman Forts on the Bar Hill’ reviewed, 468.
Mahaffy, J. P. and Goliher, W. A., their edition of Herbert Spencer’s ‘Descriptive Sociology’ reviewed, 392.
 ‘*Marie Stuart im Drama der Weltliteratur*’ reviewed, 200.
Mary Stuart, 200—memorials in Westminster Abbey, 200—Lady Blennerhassett on, 201—Battle of Pinkie, 201—Mary sent to France, 202—married to Dauphin Francis, 203—‘Pact of Edinburgh,’ 204—Mary leaves France, 205—arrival at Leith, 206—her moral code, 207—Elizabeth and Mary, 208—Mary married to Darnley, 209—Riccio’s promotion, 210—murder of Riccio, 211—Mary’s flight to Dunbar, 212—rise of Bothwell’s influence, 213—divorce from Darnley suggested, 214—pardon of Morton and his companions, 215—Bothwell, Maitland, and Morton meet, 216—the Casket Letters, 217—murder of Darnley, 218—Bothwell’s share in the plot, 219—Mary marries Bothwell, 220—Mary at Carberry Hill, 221—at Loch Leven Castle and Langside, 222—Elizabeth’s problem as to treatment of Mary, 223—Duke of Norfolk executed, 224—the Babington conspiracy, 225—trial of Mary, 226—Elizabeth signs death warrant, 227—execution of Mary, 228.
Merz, Dr. J. Theodore, ‘On a General Tendency of Thought during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century’ reviewed, 347.
Mitra, S. M., ‘Hindupore’ reviewed, 106.
Morris, William, ‘The Defence of Guinevere and other Poems’ reviewed, 153.

O.

- Origin of Land-Plants, The*, 299—shield fern, 299—its life history, 300—Professor Hofmeister on alternation of generations, 301—structure and division of cells, 302—cytology or science of cells, 303—green algae, 304—reproduction, 305—Campbell’s ‘Lectures on the Evolution of Plants,’ 306—liverworts, 306—classification of cryptogams and phanerogams, 307—distinction between spores and seeds, 308—sexual generation in mosses and liverworts, 309—Professor Bower’s ‘The Origin of a Land Flora,’ 310—homologous and antithetic theories of generation, 311—development of vascular system, 312—heterosporry, 313—*Cycas*

and *Gingko biloba*, 314—pollen-tube fertilisation, 315—coniferous trees, 316—appearance of flowering plants, 317—colour selection in flowers, 318—Dicotyledons and Monocotyledons, 319—the future of botany, 320.

P.

Park, Alexander: see Macdonald, George.

Philippon, Martin, 'Histoire du Règne de Marie Stuart' reviewed, 200.

Piépape, Le Général de, 'Le Duchesse du Maine, Reine de Sceaux et Conspiratrice (1676-1753)' reviewed, 491.

Political Predicament, The, 255—'Home Rule' and 'Tariff Reform' used as electioneering phrases, 256—Liberal policy not one of revolution, 257—failure of Veto Conference, 258—the Budget dissolution, 259—protection and privilege, 260—Parliament Bill, 261—fiscal questions in Canada and United States, 262—the Parliament Bill a stepping-stone to Home Rule, 263—What does Home Rule mean? 264—'Home Rule' all round, 265—finance to remain under control of House of Commons, 267—closure and guillotine, 268—redistribution of seats needed, 268—payment of Members, 269 f.—Mr. Asquith on the Referendum, 271—Lord Lansdowne on reform of House of Lords, 272—Mr. Balfour on the Referendum and Tariff Reform, 273—difficulties in the use of the Referendum, 274 f.

Pollard, A. F., 'The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603)' and 'Henry VIII' reviewed, 229.

Pollen, T. K., 'Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots (1561-7)' reviewed, 200.

'*Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland (1899-1906)*' reviewed, 486.

Pursuit of Reason, The, 347—starting-point in pursuit of knowledge, 347—definition of 'manifold' and 'whole,' 348—scientific knowledge proceeds by analysis, 349—process of analysis has no finality, 350—the artist sees things as a whole, 351—science deals with the manifold, 352—capacity for apprehension and means of communication, 354—conception and interpretation of a message, 355—the evolution of the universe as a whole, 356—R. L. Stevenson's 'Weir of Hermiston,' 357—the individual as ends and means, 358—the aims of an orator, 359—the drama compared with an oration, 360—the sphere of the playwright and actors, 361—to know the whole we must be outside of time, 362—time relation between parts and the whole, 364—our examination must start from experience, 365—M. Bergson and Mr. William James, 367—the limitations of science, 368.

Q.

Quiller-Couch, Arthur, 'The Oxford Book of Ballads' reviewed, 153.

R.

- Reid, G. Archibald, 'The Laws of Heredity' reviewed, 77.
 'Republican Text Book for the Congressional Campaign (1910)' reviewed, 32.
 Reynolds Green, J., Sc.D., F.R.S., F.L.S., 'A History of Botany' reviewed, 299.
 Right to Work, *The*, 180—demoralizing effect of unemployment, 181—true conceptions of 'work' and 'right,' 182 f.—meaning of the phrase 'right to work,' 183—relation of the State to the individual, 184—'doing work' viewed as a legal contract, 185—illegality of forcing State to supply work, 186—factors which determine work to be supplied, 187—rate of wages, 188—logical conclusions to be drawn from the claim, 189—afforestation or land reclamation, 190—limitation of State undertakings, 191—Hollisley Bay example, 191 f.—the skilled unemployed, 193—the right of the State to control workmen, 194—the economic aspect, 195 f.—relation of wages to taxes, 197—moral aspect, 198 f.—previous schemes, 199.
 Roman Scotland, 486—Roman historical references to Scottish affairs, 469—walls of Hadrian and Pius, 470—remains at Gask, Camelon and Lyne, 470 f.—Corbridge, 471—Newstead and Bar Hill, 473—Gartshore, 474—tribute to Mr. Curle and Dr. Macdonald, 474—death of Nero, 475—Agricola and Tacitus, 476—Roman method of conquest, 477—forts of Agricola, 478—Inchtuthill, 479—recall of Agricola, 480—Romans withdraw to the Tweed, 481—Trajan's Dacian campaign, 481—Tyne to Solway wall, 482—Pius moves the frontier to the Forth, 483—Clyde to Forth wall, 484—Peel earthwork at Kirkintilloch, 485—Septimius Severus, 487 f.—Risingham, 488—Roman influence on Scotland, 489.
 Rosebery's Chatham, Lord, 277—Almon's 'Anecdotes,' 277—Macaulay and Carlyle on Chatham, 278—motives and intimate life of Chatham not understood, 279—Colonel Yule's edition of Hedge's Diary, 280—Chatham's correspondence, 280 f.—other sources of information, 282—Lord Rosebery's qualifications for task, 283—his pen portraits of Bubb Dodington, Carteret and Temple, 284—War of the Austrian Succession, 285—Chatham as an orator, 286 f.—Horace Walpole's reports, 287 f.—Chatham's fertility of invention, 288—his capacity of self-control and self-education, 289—relations with Thomas Pitt, 290—public confidence in Chatham, 291 f.—opinion of Frederick the Great, 292—the Militia Bill, 294—Chatham's attacks on fellow-politicians, 295—his sincerity, 298—Chatham and Shelburne, 297—appreciation of Lord Rosebery's work, 298.
 'Rosebery, Lord, 'Chatham, His Early Life and Connections' reviewed, 277.
 'Royal Commission appointed to inventory the Ancient and Historical

Monuments and Constructions of Wales and Monmouthshire, Report of reviewed, 370.

'*Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions of Scotland, Report of*' reviewed, 370.

'*Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England) and Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Hertfordshire, Report of*' reviewed, 370.

'*Royal Commission on University Education in London. Minutes of Evidence (1909-10)*' reviewed, 57.

Russell, Bertram, M.A., F.R.S., '*Philosophical Essays*' reviewed, 347.

'*Russo-Japonaise, La guerre,*' reviewed, 321.

'*Russo-Japanese War, Official History of,*' reviewed, 321.

S.

Saintsbury, George, '*A History of English Prosody from the Twelfth Century to the Present Day*' reviewed, 1.

Scott, D.H., LL.D., Ph.D., F.R.S., '*Studies in Fossil Botany*' reviewed, 299.

Seward, A. C., M.A., F.R.S., '*Fossil Plants*' reviewed, 299.

Southey, R., '*Ballads and Metrical Tales*' reviewed, 153.

Stopes, Marie C., D.Sc., Ph.D., F.L.S., '*Ancient Plants*' reviewed, 299.

Strasburger, Dr. Edward, '*A Text-Book of Botany*' reviewed, 299.

T.

Tudor Kings, Our, 229—Dr. Hunt's assistants, 229—Battle of Bosworth, 230—Edmund Tudor marries Margaret Beaufort, 231—need of a strong king in England, 232—secret of Henry VII's power, 233—his economic history, 234—the English Navy at Henry VIII's accession, 235—Henry and Church property, 236 f.—mortuaries and tithes, 238—ascendency of Thomas Cromwell, 239—general tendency towards close corporations, 240—Wyatt's rebellion, 241 f.—Mary and Cardinal Pole, 243—death of Mary, 244—accession of Elizabeth, 245—Act of Supremacy and Act of Uniformity, 245—early difficulties of Elizabeth's reign, 246—Mr. Pollard on Darnley, 247 f.—Mary's complicity in Darnley's murder, 248—religious troubles of Elizabeth's reign, 249—negotiations between Duke of Anjou and Elizabeth, 250—Massacre of St. Bartholomew, 251—Macaulay quoted, 252—war with Spain, 253—growing strength of House of Commons, 254.

U.

United States and the Tariff, The, 32—Payne-Aldrich tariff, 32—McKinley and Dingley tariffs, 33—popular resentment against the Taft administration, 34—representation on the Ways and Means Committee, 35—consumers and their interests, 36—

duty on hides and silk and cotton goods, 37—Joseph Cannon as speaker, 38—Mr. Taft sides with stand-patters, 39—Mr. Taft favours election of Mr. Cannon, 40—Mr. Taft and woollen schedule, 41—New England dominated revision of 1909, 42—Mr. Champ Clark as Democratic leader, 43—Mr. Woodrow Wilson elected governor of New Jersey, 44—Mr. A. P. Gorman, 45—Senator Beveridge quoted, 46 f.—Senator Cummins, 48—fifteen-cent. magazines, 49—revolt against 1909 tariff, 50—Mr. Taft's letter in Republican Congressional Campaign Book of 1910, 51 ff.—his letter from Beverly, Mass., 53—Mr. Eugene Foss attacks textile schedules, 54—Mr. Roosevelt at Sioux Falls, 55—prospects for revision in 1911, 56.

W.

Weale, B. L., 'The Conflict of Colour' reviewed, 419.

Werner, E. T. C., his edition of Herbert Spencer's 'Descriptive Sociology' reviewed, 392.

Wilson, Brigadier-General H. H., C.B., D.S.O., 'Initiative and the Power of Manœuvre' reviewed, 321.

END OF VOL. CCXIII.



P
LE
E

Edin. Review

Author

2/3 Jan. & Apr. 1911

Title

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

